

CONTENTS

APRIL, MAY, JUNE,

1937

	PAGE
The Coronation of Christian Kings	
By Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B.	191
Spain under Communist Control	
By G. M. Godden	200
General Franco's New Spain	
By E. Allison Peers	221
The Church in Germany and Austria	
By C. F. Melville	232
Rome and Reaction	
By Michael de la Bedoyere	244
Tradition and Social Justice	
By Bernard Wall	254
An Internuncio in England, 1830-31	
By Rev. Nicholas Kelly	265
Metropolitan Man	
Stanislaus Seuffert	282
Catholics and the Woolsack	
By Derek Harbord and Ralph Cusack	295
Modern Catholic Architecture in Scotland	
By Peter F. Anson	311
Lamps of Fire	
By Geraldine Hodgson	327
Dante Gabriel Rossetti	
By Dom Thomas V. Moore	345
Some Recent Books - - - - -	361

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF G. K. CHESTERTON; ST. FRANCIS DE SALES; HENRIETTA MARIA; OLD NURSE; IN MY PATH; THE ARABIAN KNIGHT; ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI; ST. ANTHONY OF PADUA; CARDINAL MANNING; WRESTLERS WITH CHRIST; A LITERARY HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN FRANCE—Vol. III: THE TRIUMPH OF MYSTICISM; THE MYSTIC LIFE OF GRACES; THE PAIN OF THIS WORLD AND THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD; CABINET GOVERNMENT; WESTMINSTER ABBEY; THE EMPIRE'S CROWN; FORGOTTEN SERMONS; DREAMS AND MEMORIES; I TOOK OFF MY TIE; ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF MEDIAEVAL EUROPE; CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION: PRINCIPLES, PURPOSE AND PRACTICE; A PRIMER OF SOCIAL SCIENCE; REPORT ON THE VISIT BY AN ALL-PARTY GROUP OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO SPAIN; A CATHOLIC LOOKS AT SPAIN; DEMOCRACY AND REVOLUTION; PEACE AND THE CLERGY; PROPHETS AND PRINCES.

THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW

APRIL

BRITAIN AND UNITED
IRELAND W. A. NEWMAN

A CERTAIN MODERA-
TION J. A. SPENDER

INDIA REFORM IN
BEING LORD MESTON

MALAGA AND
AFTER CHARLES DUFF

DUTCH INTERIORS . DR. G. J. RENIER

DEFENCE AT THE
IMPERIAL CON-
FERENCE H. V. HODSON

EBB AND FLOW . . STEPHEN GWYNN

3s. 6d.

£2 2s. per annum

13 Buckingham Street,
Strand, W.C.2, London

or of all Booksellers

The Dublin Review

APRIL, 1937

No. 401

THE CORONATION OF CHRISTIAN KINGS

THE ceremony of the royal sacring which will take place at Westminster on 12 May, and for which excited preparations are now going forward, draws attention to an ancient rite whose interest is great for archaeologists and historians, and, particularly, for liturgists. England is the only country which has kept a concrete relic of an observance which throughout the middle ages was of the greatest importance in religious and even in civil history. We shall deal here more especially with the origins of royal sacring in general and its history in mediaeval times.

Even among the pagans the beginning of a new reign, whether of an emperor or of a king, was naturally the occasion of a solemn public demonstration. We learn from a Latin historian that Tacitus was in 275 elected by the Roman Senate with the acclamation, "Tacitus Augustus! May the gods keep him"; this acclamation was taken up and repeated by the people, and Tacitus was thus accepted as emperor (Vopiscus, *Tacitus*, 3-9). A few years later Pertinax was proclaimed emperor, first by the Army and then by the Senate, and the people went with him to the temple of Jupiter, where sacrifice was offered in honour of the newly elect (Herodian, *Hist.*, II, 3). Dr. R. M. Woolley, in his *Coronation Rites* (one of the most complete works on the subject), cites the case of Agamemnon in Homer and an even older one, the oldest recorded up to the present, of a king of Syria who was hallowed to the office with oil.* It is hardly necessary to recall that, in the Bible, Saul, David, and

* According to Winkler, *The Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, loc. cit., p. 9.

their successors were consecrated by an anointing with oil, a rite parallel to the anointing of priests and prophets.*

But, curiously enough, this biblical precedent influenced the sacring of Christian monarchs but slowly, as will be seen in a moment. The traditions which determined the elements of the ceremony seem to have derived directly from those of pagan Rome rather than from the Bible. Thus, for their coronation the emperors at Byzantium, Constantine and his successors, were content to follow the usages which immediately preceded them, which usages naturally had nothing Christian about them; the emperor was acclaimed, lifted up on the shield, crowned with the diadem, and vested in a purple cloak.† The first emperor whose coronation had a certain religious character was Leo I, in 457. He was acclaimed in the hippodrome, and there he was dressed in the imperial robes, assumed the diadem, and took the sword and shield; among the other important people present was the patriarch of Constantinople, but it is not certain that it was he who put the diadem on the head of the new emperor. At the crowning of Anastasius the Silentiary in 491, the patriarch Euthymius took a more effective part: he required a written oath from the emperor, he said a prayer followed by *Kyrie eleison*, and he put on him the purple cloak and the diadem. The acclamations of the people followed, and these, too, had a religious character.‡ In time the imperial coronation became a more complex ceremony, and its religious aspect was more and more marked. Under Phocas (602) and Heraclius (610) its place was moved from the hippodrome to the church and the patriarch took the principal part in it.

When we turn to the West we find that the sacring of kings began later than in the East, as a comparison of the following dates will show:

* There are numerous references to such anointing in the Old Testament; the texts are given by Woolley, loc. cit., pp. 3, 4. See also the present writer's article, "Huile" in *Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de liturgie*, t. vi, col. 2784.

† E. Beurlier, *Essai sur le culte rendu aux empereurs* (Paris, 1890).

‡ The most complete account is that of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Caeremoniis*, I, p. 92, summarized in Woolley, loc. cit., p. 12 et seq.

The Coronation of Christian Kings 193

BYZANTIUM
Leo I, 457
Anastasius, 491

THE WEST

—
—
Aidan, 574
Visigothic kings
Wamba, 672
(Clovis, 481-511)
Pepin the Short, 752
Charlemagne, 800

The sacring of the emperors at Constantinople is then earlier by over a century than the first mentioned consecration of a Christian king in the West.

This first known consecration is that of King Aidan of Scotland by St. Columba at Iona.* At a little later date there is the testimony of Gildas for the sacring of kings in Britain.† He says that the kings among the Britons "are anointed, only to be beheaded later on". These two pieces of evidence have been rejected by some as being merely metaphorical statements of uncertain meaning.‡ But that these two statements, so close in time and place, are not metaphorical but set out objective facts seems to be confirmed by the fact that some time later on, in 752, Pepin the Short was consecrated by St. Boniface; Boniface was born and brought up in the West of England, and probably took the rite of sacring from his place of origin to the Continent.

Royal sacring can be examined in specially good circumstances where Spain is concerned, for the rites that were used there are known, and, what is very valuable, there are several well-established dates. St. Julian in 672 gives an account of the sacring of King Wamba in the praetorian church at Toledo; he speaks of the institution as being already old and well known before his time. Its elements are:

- (1) The king's oath, or *professio fidei*.
- (2) The anointing and the blessing.
- (3) Antiphons, Old Testament lesson, hymns; exhortation to the king on his duties.
- (4) Prayer and final blessing.

* Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbae*, III, p. 5.

† Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, c. xix.

‡ This is Woolley's opinion, loc. cit., p. 36.

We see, then, that Visigothic Spain had a rite for the consecration of kings in the middle of the seventh century. From whence did the church of Toledo get it? The answer to this question (like so many others arising out of the liturgy that is called Mozarabic) is still a matter of uncertainty among historians. It is known that this liturgy took a number of ceremonies and formulas from the old Roman liturgy and from that of Constantinople, but it is evident that the rite of royal sacring was not one of them. As has been pointed out above, the Roman liturgy at this time had not got such a rite, while that of Constantinople was quite different and, in particular, did not include an anointing. One naturally thinks of the Gallican liturgy, which presents considerable analogy with the Mozarabic, but here, too, opinions are divided. Some think that the Mozarabic liturgy is earlier than the Gallican, while others, following Lebrun, maintain the contrary and seek to prove that the Mozarabic was largely inspired by the Gallican. These opposing views cannot be discussed here.* It is sufficient to emphasize the fact that in Christian Spain in the middle of the seventh century the consecration of kings was carried out with a rite whose character was already well evolved.

Historians seemed recently to be agreed that in France, where royal sacring was to have so great an importance, there was no question of its having taken place before the middle of the ninth century, under the Carolingians; the view that sacring was contemporaneous with Clovis (beginning of the sixth century) was unanimously rejected. But the whole question has been reopened, and we are taken to an epoch before that of the Carolingians by the discovery by Dom Morin, in a manuscript that may belong to the seventh century, of blessings at the sacring of a king, with a prayer at the anointing of his hands.† The significance of this discovery has been disputed, notably by Bloch and by those who deny the consecration of Clovis and all idea of

* The writer has treated the question in his article, "Mozarabe (liturgie)" in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de liturgie*, to which he ventures to refer the reader.

† Dom Germain Morin, "Un recueil gallicain inédit en marge à Freising aux 7-9e siècle" in *Revue Bénédictine*, t. xxix, pp. 168-94 (1912).

such a sacring under the Merovingians ; nor, if we are rightly informed, has Dom Morin yet vindicated his discovery. But it does not seem to us that this text can simply be rejected : it establishes that, at some date during the Merovingian age, allusion was made to a sacring and to anointing on the hand.

In the Carolingian age we know certainly from documents that Pepin the Short, the first of his race, was consecrated by St. Boniface in 752 and then, with his two sons, by Pope Stephen II in 764, and that Charlemagne was consecrated solemnly by Pope Leo III in 800. We also know of the consecration of Louis the Religious, Lothaire, Charles the Bald, Louis II, etc. The last two have a special importance, because the ceremony was presided over by Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, and there are among his works the blessing and prayer which are found in part in the present *Pontificale Romanum*, Part I, "De benedictione et coronatione Regis" (i, *Coronatio Caroli Calvi* ; ii, *Coronatio Ludovici II.*—P.L., t. cxxv, cols. 803-18). There follow two other coronations, of Queen Judith and of Queen Hermentrudis, which are of the same inspiration.

These documents are not in the form of ordinary rituals, such as those which are found in the Egbert *Pontificale*, and in other liturgical books of the ninth and tenth centuries, but are rather fragments which the author has brought together ; nevertheless, they include the essential elements of sacring, viz. :

- (1) Presentation of the candidate by the bishops.
- (2) The royal oath.
- (3) Addresses, and blessing of the monarch.
- (4) Anointing with chrism.
- (5) Conferring of the crown, the palm-branch, and the sceptre (there is no mention of the sword, which has a prominent place in later rituals).
- (6) *Te Deum* and *Laudes* (acclamations).

Though other documents may be earlier, these have a special value in that they can be dated and assigned to a known author : Charles the Bald was crowned at Metz in 869, Louis II at Compiègne in 877.

An examination of the Order for the Blessing and Crowning of a King in Part I of the present *Pontificale Romanum* shows that the principal elements mentioned by Hincmar, and even some of his formulas, have been adopted therein. For example, there are the three proper prayers of the Mass, all from Hincmar.

Collect.—Quaesumus, omnipotens Deus, ut famulus tuus N—rex noster, qui tua miseratione suscepit regni gubernacula, virtutum etiam omnium percipiat incrementa, quibus decenter ornatus, et vitiorum monstra devitare et ad te, qui via, veritas et vita es, gloriosus valeat pervenire. Per. [*P.L.*, t. cxxv, col. 808.]

Secret.—Munera quaesumus, Domine, oblata sanctifica, ut nobis unigeniti tui corpus et sanguis fiant, et Carolo regi nostro ad obtinendam animae corporisque salutem, te largiente usque quaque proficiant. Per.* [*Loc. cit.*, 808.]

Postcommunion.—Haec, Domine, communio salutaris famulum tuum ab omnibus tueatur adversis, quatenus et ecclesiasticae pacis obtineat tranquillitatem et post istius temporis decursum ad aeternam perveniat haereditatem. Per. [*Ib.*]

The blessing by the prelate at the anointing in the *Pontificale Romanum* ("Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, creator et gubernator coeli et terrae . . .", p. 242) is also inspired almost word for word by that of Hincmar (*loc. cit.*, cols. 809, 810).† It is worth noting that the blessing of the sceptre in the *Pontificale Romanum* ("Accipe virgam virtutis . . .", p. 250) includes one of the special Advent antiphons called "The Great O's": "[O] clavis David et sceptrum domus Israel, qui aperis et nemo claudit . . ." etc. Unfortunately, the origin of this prayer is not known, so it does not help to fix the date of that antiphon.

During the sacring of Queen Hermentrudis there was said at the anointing a long prayer beginning, "Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeternae Deus, qui potestate virtutis tuae . . ." This was not borrowed by the

* It has been remarked that this prayer alludes to the elect as receiving communion under both species. But the custom of communion in both kinds was general at this period, and it continued for a long time at the sacring of kings.

† On this point, and on the different documents of the *Pontificale Romanum*, cf. Dom P. de Puniet, *Le Pontifical romain*, t. ii, cap. x, "Le sacre royal".

Pontificale but by the *Missale Romanum*, for the votive Mass *Pro sponso et sponsa*; this Mass has two proper prayers after the Our Father, the second of which is, with a few variations, the same as that used at the sacring of Hermentrudis.

This is not the place to discuss the theories of Hincmar and the bishops of his time on the relation between Church and State, though they are being very seriously studied today.* But we can at least recall the grandeur and solemnity of the ceremonies of sacring in the ninth century. Under the Capetians, under the kings of England, and under the German emperors, they underwent many important modifications, but in the days of Hincmar they still had their primitive character; sacring was a liturgical rite, a sacramental—almost, says Renan, an eighth sacrament—whose object was to give a sacred impress to the person of the king and to assure the union of the two powers, civil and religious.

So far as the history of the Roman liturgy is concerned, it may be pointed out that during the first three centuries it was essentially local, the liturgy of the City of Rome and of the Popes, and it was formed and developed in accordance with its own needs and genius. But during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries it was influenced by the liturgies of Jerusalem and Constantinople, and perhaps others. This aspect of the Roman liturgy is well known, and detailed studies of it have been published.† The sixth and seventh centuries were its golden age, and the Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian sacramentaries, the Gregorian antiphoner, several lectionaries, and other fragments date from that time; in the following period it seems to have confined itself to a jealous guarding of its treasures, and the Gallican liturgies (from which the German must not be separated) took the lead in matters of divine worship. Their influence on the Roman liturgy from the eighth to the tenth or eleventh century is a subject which, in our

* It is enough to cite two works of Canon Arquillière, *Saint Grégoire VII* and *Augustinisme politique*, which contain ample bibliographies.

† Among recent works reference may be made to the chapter on "Eastern Rome in the Liturgy" in Cardinal Schuster's *The Sacramentary*. Vol. V, p. 1 et seq.

opinion, has never been tackled boldly enough, and the example which we have given above seems sufficiently striking to show the need for methodical study of this influence.

To follow the history of royal sacring in the different nations would take us too far ; it is sufficient to say that in France and Germany and Rome and England this ceremony of consecrating kings and emperors went on getting more complex and more complete. And the rite in the *Pontificale Romanum* is not the one that has evolved in the most diverse ways in accordance with the spirit of the age and political ideas. The most notable example of this is the *Liber Regalis* in England. The meaning of the earlier coronation ceremony was profoundly modified in this country by the Protestant revolution, under the influence of Henry VIII, Elizabeth, and their successors. English writers, especially the more recent ones, have set out in detail how the character of the rite was altered during the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and even the nineteenth centuries, till today only a few traces of the Christian sacring are left.

To get a more exact idea of this it is necessary to turn to the rite of sacring of kings in the *Pontificale Romanum*, which has been inspired by the oldest Christian traditions. As usual in the composition of her liturgical books, Rome has in this rite done away with everything that would be contrary to strict orthodoxy : she has avoided the two excesses by which certain countries have been troubled, namely, *Caesaropapism*, which attributes to the civil power illegitimate rights over the religious power, and *episcopalization*, one of the manifestations of this error. At one time in some countries the king or emperor at his sacring arrogated to himself the right to sing the epistle or the gospel, as though he were a subdeacon or a deacon, or to dress himself in the stole, the chasuble, the cope, the amice, or other ecclesiastical insignia. In her pontifical, Rome has removed from the rite anything which could be made the subject of a false interpretation, at the same time being careful to keep the essential characteristics of the old ceremony, viz. the recognition of the elect by the Church, the royal oath and promise to govern in accord-

ance with the laws and with justice, the blessing of the diadem, the word, and other insignia, the anointing with the oil of catechumens, the enthronement, the Mass with proper prayers for the new monarch, and the *Te Deum* by way of thanksgiving. Several of these observances are ancient and inspired by those which Hincmar used at the sacring of Charles the Bald and Louis II.

Historically speaking, the royal sacring is one of the most interesting rites in the pontifical. It still shows signs of an age when the Church regarded kingship as the highest of all civil functions, which accordingly had to be consecrated by a most solemn religious rite; it is not, indeed, a sacrament, but it *is* a sacramental. We have quoted the saying of Renan (well informed in ecclesiastical matters, as he had reason to be) that the royal sacring is *almost* like an eighth sacrament; the word "almost" is essential, but the statement is correct: sacring is not a sacrament, it is a sacramental. The now classical distinction between a sacrament and a sacramental reminds us that the sacraments were instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ and have effect, as the theologians say, *ex opere operato*, while the sacramentals, instituted or recognized by the Church, have effect *ex opere operantis*.

Some legists have wanted to see in royal sacring a sacrament and a sort of priesthood; this can be done only by abuse, and it has not been difficult for Catholic theologians to refute the error.*

It is a matter for rejoicing that England still keeps some parts of the old ceremonial, and it is to be hoped that one day the rite will be revised to bring it into accord with its full Christian meaning and the traditions of the past, a revision that is necessary in the eyes of such recent historians as H. Murray and Ratcliffe. England would thus give a new proof of her care for and attachment to old customs on a future solemn occasion like to that which will unite representatives of all the countries of the world at Westminster on 12 May.

F. CABROL.

* Cf., especially, Thurston, art. "Coronation" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, and in *Coronation Ceremonies* (C.T.S., 1911).

SPAIN UNDER COMMUNIST CONTROL :

JULY-DECEMBER 1936

"Our theory is a manual of action."—LENIN.

FOR six months a great part of Spain has been under Communist power. These Spanish cities, towns, and villages afford a unique opportunity for estimating exactly what Communist power means, when exercised freely, and without any external coercion from pressure of public opinion. For many reasons it was almost impossible to arrive at accurate descriptions of the three years of "pure Communism" in Soviet Russia; those years before the overwhelming horror of the famine of 1921, which compelled Lenin to accept the modifications of the "nep" policy, and to permit a measure of State capitalism and the reintroduction of bureaucracy. But pure Communism, allied with Syndicalism and with the curious Spanish development of Anarchism, has been in untrammelled action, over more than one-third of Spain, since 18 July, 1936. And Spain is near enough to England for a very considerable body of evidence to be available today concerning the experiences of Spanish townsmen and villagers under the new régime. That evidence is summarized in the following pages. It is of intimate concern to all other countries, and not the least to England; for, as the Archbishop of Westminster reminded us, in a statement issued last August, conditions in Spain touch us "nearer than we appear to think, and we may well reflect that our own house is in danger when our neighbour's party-wall is aflame".

The Communist domination in Spain was gaining strength during the first half of last year, as readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW are already aware.* It was a sporadic strength, dependent for its exercise on the impotence of the *Frente Popular* Government. But in a moment, without any warning to the bulk of the people of Spain, Communism seized "All Power" in

* "Communist Operations in Spain", DUBLIN REVIEW, October 1936. (Reprinted as a pamphlet, price 2d., Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne, 43 Newgate St., London, E.C.1.)

Spanish cities, towns, and villages, after 18 July. Here are a few typical examples of unfettered Communist action in the villages of southern Spain, last July. In the village of Arahall¹ the "masses" seized "All Power" on 19 July. The churches were looted, and statues and altars were burnt. The burning of the statues is instructive in view of the widespread allegations that ammunition had been stored in Spanish churches; ammunition cannot be hidden in statues. One of the statues destroyed was a beautiful sixteenth-century statue of the Christ of Compassion. Twenty-three people were locked up in a building; buckets of petrol were thrown through the windows and set on fire; all the prisoners, with one exception, were burnt alive.

The Communist rule over the village of Aznalcollar² began on 18 July and continued till 17 August, when the Nationalist troops restored order. The girls' elementary school was used as a prison; on the afternoon of 16 August the Communists threw hand-grenades at the doors so as to terrify the prisoners into running into a courtyard at the back of the building. As they ran they were riddled with bullets. These murdered villagers included a farmer, a day-labourer, a carpenter, a shop-assistant, a barber, and a baker. This method of mass shooting in a courtyard repeats, precisely, the methods of the Soviet Chekhas in the early days of the Russian Revolution. The Communist rulers of this village further decided to shoot every man who had been married in church by a priest since the advent of the Republic—a decision duly carried out. On 23 July, prisoners in the courtyard of the gaol at La Campana³ were shot down; and petrol was poured on both the dead and on those still alive, and fired. These prisoners included a carpenter, a porter, a taxi-driver, a shoemaker, and two farmers. At Almendralejo⁴ the procedure varied a little. Some thirty-eight prisoners—men, women, and children—were nailed to the wall of the prison yard; crucified thus, they were then saturated with petrol and burnt to death. When the Nationalist troops arrived, prison servants were disinfecting the courtyard, "but the smell of disinfectant did not overcome the unpleasant smell of the burnt

bodies". At Fuente de Cantos,⁵ on 19 July, many arrests were made "with a great show of swords, axes, revolvers, and clubs", including a mother with a child of three and an infant at the breast, and the prisoners were placed in the principal church of the town. They were then driven into the sacristy and shot down with rifles, guns, and revolvers; the doors and windows were soaked with petrol and fired, and cotton wool saturated with petrol was thrown into the sacristy. Nine prisoners were burnt alive, and three were shot dead. The municipal offices were looted, and all the rural and urban papers and municipal archives were burnt.

A "Soviet" gained control of the village of Constantina⁶ on 18 July and proceeded to destroy the magnificent parish church, built by Juan de Herrera, the architect of the Escorial; and to murder the parish priest, and also the wife of the Town Treasurer, whom they found at prayer in the church when they arrived. In all, 150 victims of the local "Soviet" were killed in this village. In the village of Espejo all the official archives were burnt; in the village of Barraco all municipal documents were stolen. The village of Escalona⁷ was seized by the Communists on 16 July.

The churches were profaned, and the statues burnt. The village cross was destroyed and a dance-platform was erected on the site. The priest, aged sixty-two, was told that his life would be spared if he would curse God; his reply was, "Long live Christ the King!"—upon which he was dragged through the streets and then killed. The body of a little child was exhumed and carried through the village on a tray. In Griñon, eleven Brothers of Christian Doctrine were martyred; and the nuns of the local convent were stripped naked, and driven forward with blows from rifle-butts. A Communist State was declared, on 23 July, in the village of Lora del Rio;⁸ and the occasion was celebrated by burning the churches. Cartloads of residents were taken to the cemetery and made to dig a huge grave; they were then shot in the legs so that they fell in agony into the grave. Some were buried alive. The people living near the village cemetery heard the cries and

groans of those left to die on the ground and fled from their homes, unable to endure these sights and sounds; they were threatened with death if they went to the relief of the dying. The eyes of one of the prisoners were pierced with a needle before he was shot. A local "Soviet" was set up in the village of Palma del Condado⁹ on 18 July; the parish church was burnt and also the Sanctuary of Our Lady of the Valley, Patroness of the village, and a statue of the Sacred Heart in the square near the church was destroyed—all in the typical Soviet manner. Sixteen prisoners were shot down in the prison courtyard, including a butcher and a cooper.

The country towns experienced the same results from Communist rule. Space permits of only a few examples. Communists took control of the town of Palma del Rio on 18 July. All religious objects in the churches, and in the Convent of St. Clare, were destroyed; vestments and statues were dragged through the streets and publicly burnt; and many residents, including a local doctor and a woman chemist, were shot. Whole families were wiped out in the town of Posadas,¹⁰ which fell under Communist rule on 18 July; and one of the local Marxist leaders made a practice of threatening girls with a revolver, and then violating them, to the "intense amusement" of his companions. When the Communist rule was instituted, on 24 July, at Puente Genil,¹¹ seven churches were burnt; prisoners were flogged with ox sinews; one resident was hacked to death with axes and the body then dismembered; F. O. Montilla, aged seventy, and his wife were tied to their bed, soaked with petrol, and then burnt alive; M. M. Lopez was killed with an axe, after which his head was cut off and carried through the village—an incident repeated, as we shall see, in Barcelona; all the statues in the churches were hacked in pieces with axes; the head of the statue of Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception was used as a football; the vestments were dragged through the dust of the streets; and 154 of the townsfolk were murdered, many of them being shot by lads of from sixteen to eighteen years of age.

The Communist Soviet in the town of Anteguera,¹² besides looting the churches, demonstrated a special

hatred for the statue of Cristo del Perdon, dragging this image of Our Lord through the streets before finally burning it. One prisoner was refused food or drink for six days, and then shot; another was dragged all day long up and down the streets of the town, agonized with thirst, and then killed; over the sown fields petrol was poured and then set alight.

In the town of Baena the wife and three children of a Nationalist soldier were murdered; one of the children, six years old, had received seven hatchet wounds.¹³ Communist rule obtained in the town of Belmetz from 25 July. The churches and the town hall were sacked; all religious statues were destroyed; the mass executions included that of Carlos Lopez, who was brutally thrashed and shot, then had his legs cut off, and was left to die on the ground, and the burning-alive of prisoners sprayed with petrol.¹⁴

Meanwhile, the terror that is indispensable to Communist strategy was let loose in the cities, no less than in the little country villages and the towns of rural Spain. Again, space allows of only a few typical instances. By 23 July every church in Barcelona, except the cathedral, had been fired; in one church a priest was burnt alive. On 23 July came the accounts of the beheading of three Jesuit priests at Barcelona; and of the carrying of their heads on salvers through the streets. In Barcelona also, nuns were stripped of their clothing and pushed naked into the streets. And in that first week of the Spanish Civil War the masses in Barcelona copied very faithfully the model of the French Revolution; the mob paraded the streets of the city "attired in the robes of the ecclesiastical authorities". The nature of the régime already dominant in Barcelona appears from an incidental observation of the *Times* correspondent, referring to the foreign Consuls: "Their motor-cars went about everywhere . . . receiving the Communist salute of the clenched fist"—not, be it observed, the Spanish salute.¹⁵ The same dispatch continues under date of 23 July: "I came to three great buildings in flames, the church of La Cor de Maria, a religious publishing-house, and a school . . . the situation appeared to be in charge of a

Red captain. Someone threw half-burnt cassocks belonging to priests from a window. The crowd found the incident amusing, and laughed. . . . Further on a small group of men and boys had entered a convent school, where they were destroying furniture, pictures, and statues and preparing to set them on fire. A man with a wooden mallet was breaking the statue of a saint. Women and girls stood about laughing . . . on a corner was a group of men discussing a machine-gun. 'We have taken all the arms from the San Andrea barracks,' a man told me; 'is it not nice that the workers should have arms and power?'" On Tuesday morning, the dispatch says further, the two churches of Santa Ana—"among the most beautiful churches in the city"—were burning, and "in a small chapel opening on to the cloister, youths were on the altar tearing down the reredos, statues, and pictures . . . as I passed out of the enclave I caught a glimpse through a doorway of a crucifix wrapped in flames".¹⁶

A few days later, in a dispatch of 31 July,¹⁷ the *Times* correspondent reports from Barcelona extensive "mopping-up tactics, part of the process of advancing the [Communist] revolution towards its still enigmatic objective". In other words, this reluctant observer* was constrained to admit a systematic plan at work, within ten days of the outbreak of the Civil War, to terrorize not the military forces of General Franco, but the people of Spain. This plan, as we shall see, coincides moreover in every respect with the terrorist formulas for the proletarian seizure of all power laid down by Lenin, and carried out in Russia in 1917-18. This is what the cautious *Times* reporter saw in Barcelona, that last week of July: "The anti-Fascist revolution in Barcelona has become a reign of terror . . . with the searching of houses by 'purification' squads, the seizure of individuals or of whole families, and their subsequent assassination in lonely spots, and the murder of nuns and priests." On the morning of 27 July five Dominican nuns were found to have been shot in a suburb of Barcelona; they had been lured out by a promise of safety; their bodies were

* The sympathies of *The Times* are with the "Government" of Madrid.

found in the undergrowth of the roadside. "Purification" squads visited the house of Señor Salvans three times, searching for "Fascists"; as none were found, on the third visit the family of eight were taken away and shot dead. Sixteen lay Nursing Brothers were taken from the largest hospital in Barcelona and murdered. On the Rabassada road, every morning, during the last week in July, were found the bodies of a dozen or more persons who had disappeared from their homes or had been taken from them by search committees. The slaughter of the living was accompanied by the derision of the dead. During that last week in July an English eye-witness saw the bodies of nuns exhumed from their graveyard, and propped up against the outside wall of the convent, with offensive labels; then men and young women danced round them.¹⁸ Again, an Englishwoman who was in Barcelona that week saw "a church burnt by the Reds, who killed a priest, cut off his arms and legs, and hung the corpse from a statue of the Virgin".¹⁹ Another Englishwoman records how a priest was hanged in Barcelona, and before he was dead he was stabbed through the body and a crucifix was put through him.²⁰

Not to depend too much on the evidence of one city, let us leave Barcelona and turn westward to Cartagena and Malaga.

In Cartagena, the Communist Committee of Control being installed, every church was pillaged—except that of La Virgen de la Caridad, which was left untouched as being the property of a foreign Congregation. It is noteworthy that the church-pillaging was carried out in accordance with a fixed plan. The looters first kept everything of value; then they pulled down the statues and ornaments and took them into the middle of the street, where stones were hurled at them till they were completely destroyed. The pieces were then taken away in a lorry to the Plaza de España, where they were piled up and burnt as far as possible. It is well to recall, also, that the plundering and destruction of churches was carried out in all the towns and villages of the province.²¹

And what was happening in Malaga in those summer days of July last? By 24 July a "Soviet" was established in

Malaga.²² Destruction and incendiarism were rampant. English eye-witnesses placed on record how they saw, through the shutters of the hotel in which they were confined, the shooting-down of priests and others "chiefly by young people between fourteen and seventeen years old. These children, who wore red ties and red shirts (the uniform of the Communist Young Pioneers), carried pistols, axes, and truncheons, with which to fell their victims".²³ The greater part of the population sought refuge in the surrounding mountains, which was not surprising as the city was entirely in the possession of an armed mob, who hunted up, imprisoned, and shot indiscriminately "all citizens suspected in any way of views unfavourable to the proletariat".²⁴ All the notarial archives were destroyed. Churches and convents were burnt and looted. At Vich, by 22 July, forty churches, chapels, and convents, and the fine old cathedral were destroyed; the churches at Pingcorda were burnt; and the cathedral of Figueras was fired. "Our theory is a manual of action", declared Lenin. Certainly the events in Spain of the last week of July 1936 carried out this Leninist dogma with complete fidelity, and thereby conveyed, as the Holy Father declared in his speech of 14 September, "the most serious lessons to Europe and to the whole world".

It is a lesson of shattering and fundamental simplicity. In the fateful summer of 1917, the last summer of Christian civilization in European and Eastern Russia—that is, in one-sixth part of the world—Lenin launched the demand "to surprise the opponent and snatch power". Later, when power had been well and truly snatched, Lenin, supreme dictator of Soviet Russia, learnt that an idealist Kamenef had repealed the death penalty. His anger knew no bounds. "That is madness", he repeated. "How can we accomplish a revolution without shooting?"* It will be remembered that a conservative estimate of the loss of life during the first four years of the process of erection of Lenin's new Soviet State was 1,766,100, chiefly by shooting. The records of the mass shootings of those early days,

* *Lenin*, by Leon Trotzky, p. 159.

carried out in the cellars of the provincial Chekhkas, as well as in the capital cities of Russia, have been faithfully reproduced on a smaller scale but with equally inhuman ferocity in Spain. Again in the repeated incidents last summer of the burning of municipal and other archives we have the conscientious carrying-out of Lenin's directions. "The workers must shatter, break, blow up the whole State machine", and: "All power to the Soviets means the thorough reconstruction of the whole State apparatus."* And again, as late as 6 November, 1917, Lenin issued a call to discard Conferences and Congresses at a moment when everything depended on the "struggle of the armed masses".† Within a few days of that call to action the guns of the *Aurora* were trained on the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg. The armed masses were sweeping Lenin into supreme power. The first act of the Spanish so-called "Government" last summer was to arm the masses. Yet again Lenin, in his famous pamphlet *Left Wing Communism*, defined the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as "the fiercest and most merciless war"; as a "resolute and persistent struggle, sanguinary and violent".‡ And, in the no less famous pamphlet *Infantile Sickness*, the great architect of concrete Communism warned his followers to expect a "war a hundred times more difficult, more long drawn out, more complicated, than the most bloodthirsty war that could be possible between nations"; and in *Insurrection* he announced that the victory of the proletariat could be achieved by "rivers of blood". These dogmas, moreover, have been carried on, since Lenin's death, by the executive power of the Soviet State. The Komintern announced, in 1928, that the "armed proletariat" will employ "ruthless bloody war"; and the official Soviet organ *Pravda*, in its issue of 9 September of that year, declared that "our programme is an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality". The little villages, the towns, and the cities of a large part of Spain were indeed, in that first week of July, a "blood-soaked

* *Revolutionary Lessons*, Lenin, p. 55.

† *On the Eve of October*, Lenin, p. 47.

‡ *Left Wing Communism*, Lenin, p. 2, p. 29.

reality". Finally, Lenin realized that the ultimate obstacle in the erection of a Marxist and Soviet State is that of religion; and that therefore, at all costs, religion must be destroyed. In 1913 Lenin wrote: "All religious ideas are an unspeakable abomination"; and again he asserted that "God is (historically and socially) first of all a complex of ideas engendered by the ignorance of mankind".* These Leninist dogmas have never ceased to be translated into action by all Communist Sections in all countries, from the highest executive authority down to the smallest branches. In 1935 the VII Soviet Congress announced, "We shall fight without mercy all who bar our way in the struggle against God." In the same year the official organ of the Soviet "League of the Godless" declared: "There must be no rest, no truce in the anti-God fight." And in February 1936 there assembled in Moscow a Congress of 1600 representatives from forty-six countries to plan the formation of an Atheist International, designed to carry out the world war upon God. Further, the fight against religion is of universal obligation for Communists throughout the world, as appears from the official *Programme of the Communist International*: "One of the most important tasks . . . is the task of systematically and unswervingly combating religion—the opium of the People."† This programme is binding on every National Section of the Party: "The decisions of the Communist International are obligatory for all the Sections of the Communist International and must be promptly carried out."‡ The Spanish Section of the Communist International most certainly "promptly carried out" the command to wage unswerving war on religion, in those first days of Communist power last July; and, as we shall see, has "systematically" developed that war in each succeeding month.

The record of the fourth week in July, and of many following weeks, in Spain is one that illustrates very forcibly the identity of "ideology and application" in regard to Communist theory and action, the realization

* *Lenin on Religion* (Little Lenin Library, Vol. VIII), pp. 50, 53.

† *Programme of the Communist International* (English edition), p. 38.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

of which was so strongly urged by the Sovereign Pontiff in his great address to the Spanish refugees last September. Speaking on the Feast of the Exaltation of Holy Cross, the Holy Father summed up, in most memorable words, the Communist onslaught upon Spain :

“All that is most humanly human, all that is most divinely Divine ; consecrated persons and sacred things and holy institutions ; inestimable and irreplaceable treasures of Faith and Christian piety, as well as of culture and art ; the most precious antiquities, the holiest of relics ; dignity, sanctity, the fruitful activity of lives wholly dedicated to religion, to science, and to charity ; the highest members of the sacred Hierarchy, Bishops and priests ; consecrated virgins ; the laity of every class and condition, venerable grey hairs and the first flowers of youth ; the very silence so sacred and so solemn of the tomb ; all has been assaulted, violated, destroyed, and in the most ruthless and barbarous ways in an unbridled and unparalleled confusion of forces so savage and so cruel as to have been thought utterly impossible for human dignity, let alone for human nature, even the most miserable and debased.”

And then the Holy Father issued his warning against the efforts of the “forces of subversion” to decoy Catholics into collaboration *“on a basis of a distinction between ideology and application, between ideas and action, between the economic and moral orders.* This insidiousness is dangerous in the extreme, and its purpose is purely and simply to disarm Europe and the world in favour of an unchanging programme of hate, subversion and destruction by which they are being threatened”. If Europe and the world will set the “ideas” of Lenin in juxtaposition with the untrammelled actions of his devoted followers the Communists of Spain, from 18 July, 1936, to the present moment, the purpose of this insidious argument will be defeated. There is no trace in the acts of the Communists in Spanish villages, towns, and cities throughout these eight months, of any “distinction”

between Marxist or Leninist ideology or ideas, and their application in swift, ruthless, and indefatigable action—action launched, to quote the Holy Father again, “madly against every form of institution, human and divine”.

Throughout August the destruction of churches, the slaughter of priests, the mass executions of unarmed civilians, in preparation for the erection of a “Spanish Socialist Soviet Republic”, continued. Madrid became the scene of outrages the savagery of which recalls Mr. H. G. Wells’s comparison of conditions under the Soviet Government and those “in a Kaffir kraal”.^{*} A priest in one of the largest churches in Madrid was seized standing before the altar. His captors subjected him to the most disgusting tortures, and afterwards his head was brought out by a youth and stuck on the railings in front of the church.²⁵ Bodies of the victims of machine-gun fire were propped up against the barrack walls of the Montaña Barracks outside Madrid, and boys of fourteen and fifteen were brought out to practise “target-shooting” at them. An English business man, Mr. Wyatt Hayward, saw no less than twenty-one churches burning in Madrid at the same moment and witnessed the outraging and shooting of Spanish girls and the wholesale massacre of priests. “Such bestiality must sicken the whole world”, declared this eye-witness, describing the tearing of victims to bits and the hanging-up of the limbs in the churches. Similar savagery in Madrid was described by Mr. J. D. Logie, Chairman of the British Residents’ Emergency Committee. By the middle of August, one observer wrote: “Since July 25 Mass has not been said in Madrid. . . . Before burning the churches, all the statues, tombs, and sacred relics were turned out and stamped underfoot, broken into thousands of pieces, and burnt. All the churches are now used as refuse dumps. . . . All the private houses with shrines have, one by one, been pillaged and destroyed.”²⁶

In the city of Tarragona all the churches and convents were burnt, and thirty priests were killed. In Valencia, as stated by Mr. L. P. Gislingham, director of a school of

^{*} *Russia in the Shadows*, H. G. Wells, p. 45.

languages in Valencia, five nuns were shot, and forty priests were killed in the basement of the Escalapias Monastery. "The men", Mr. Gislingham said, "were content with shooting to kill. The women liked their victims to be held while they slashed them with knives and then stuck parts of the butchered bodies on the monastery walls with explanatory notes. I am telling you just what I saw." From a convent in Valencia the nuns were driven out and stripped naked. The superior was a woman of seventy. She fell to the ground. A captain of the Government troops ran forward and covered her body with his cloak. He was accused of infidelity to the cause of Spain, and some of his men held him up against a wall, while another walked up with a revolver in each hand, and discharged both into his eyes.²⁷ An English visitor to Spain has placed on record how, in Valencia, on the morning of 31 July, "four Capuchin friars and five Dominican friars were butchered in the great market square, near the fragrant flower-market".²⁸ An uncensored dispatch in *The Times* mentioned that already "one of the most common words in the Spanish language, *Adios* (good-bye), is anathema on account of the mention of God. No form of salute is allowed other than *Salud, camarades*!"

By the middle of August the death-roll of priests in Barcelona alone had reached 360.

The House of the Passionist Community at Daimiel, Catalonia, was invaded and destroyed. All the Community, including the Father Provincial, were killed.²⁹ In Badajos, Mr. F. G. Sturup saw two priests who had been crucified. Their bodies, hanging on the crosses, were exhibited in a public square. They had been knifed to death, and their eyes had been cut out. Lying near the crosses was another priest who had been slashed to death, and his eyes were also cut out. Further, in Badajos, Mr. Sturup counted about a hundred men with only one ear. They were men suspected of Right sympathies, and their ears were cut off so that they could be identified if they tried to escape. They were pushed into the streets and had to stop the bleeding as best they could. Mr. Charles Sones, visiting Jaen, found that

"monks had been beheaded, and I counted eight heads hanging from railings. There were other bodies in the street. The mob had stripped twelve nuns, and paraded them through the streets to the market-place, with their hands tied behind them. Petrol was poured over them and they were burnt alive. I arrived just in time to see the bodies being reduced to ashes". Death was the penalty for attending Mass last summer in Spain. "Three nuns of the Sanatorium at Terrasa were discovered while attending Mass secretly. They were dragged out and shot 'as an example to the others'."³⁰

A visitor returned from Madrid at the end of August. He described the blazing churches, and groups of Marxist militiamen dragging out statues and furniture to make bonfires in the streets. "I saw them in some cases emerging dressed in priests' vestments, to the merriment of the mob outside . . . the Hammer and Sickle is painted over the façades, and Red flags (not the Republican flag, be it noted) fly from the towers." In Madrid the Spanish "Chekha", in August, was condemning the citizens of Madrid to death at the rate of 200 a day. Lost relatives were searched for in the city morgue. "The watchword is extermination" was the declaration in large red letters across the front page of the Communist newspaper, the *Mundo Obrero*. It was a watchword carried out with the thoroughness, the ruthlessness, the inhuman brutality of the Communist creators of the Soviet State in Russia in 1917-21. This identity of action with Soviet Russia, it is instructive to note, had been prepared by the use of Soviet propaganda films in Spain during the last five years. Soviet films, banned elsewhere in Europe, have been shown in the smaller Spanish cinemas, showing the people what was done in the Russian Revolution. Five years of this visual instruction have borne their fruit in the cities, towns, and villages of Spain in 1936. What was seen in the cinema was done in the churches, in the streets, outside the cemeteries, before the open graves into which the victims of the mass executions fell as bullets of the firing-squads reached them. Dolores Ibarruri, the famous Communist leader, known as La Passionaria from the passion of her oratory,

has proclaimed, "There can be neither truce, nor pity, nor compassion." In an uncensored dispatch *The Times* paints a vivid picture of Madrid under the pitiless Terror last August: "The first victims in Madrid were taken to the Caso de Campo, a Labour stronghold, until guards were put at the gates. Later the Prado de San Isidro became the site of the 'executions'. Then it was the walls of the cemetery up above. Numbers of people view the corpses in the early morning. . . . In the outskirts of Madrid many victims have fallen in the little garden suburbs. . . . The Ministries realize what is taking place. But they have sown the wind and now the whirlwind is upon them. The mass is armed."³¹

The mass was armed, and was directed from central points. The events in Spain, last summer and autumn, should be seen, always, in the searchlight of that great phrase of Lord Acton concerning the French Revolution: "The appalling thing in the French Revolution is not the tumult but the design."* Here is an incident demonstrating the "design" carried out in Aragon. When the civil war broke out there was a Committee in the town of Barbastro which was unwilling to shed non-combatant blood, and therefore only imprisoned the Bishop of Barbastro and the forty priests and young students of the Claretian monastery in the town. This local decision was made in the face of a mob who gathered outside the monastery, demanding that all within should be killed. For several days the prisoners prepared themselves for death with prayer, confession, and reading the Acts of the Martyrs. Then came orders from the Central Committee in Barcelona overruling the leniency of the local authority. On 2 August, the College Superior and three priests, one a Pauline Father, were led out to be shot. The Bishop, and others, were shot on 9 August. On the 13th, twenty of the young students were all shot. On the road to the place of execution they sang hymns, and cried, "Long live Christ the King!"—and with this cry on their lips they faced the firing-squads. So radiant was the expression of the priests that a young man among the onlookers stopped one of the cars carrying the Fathers

* *Lectures on the French Revolution*, Lord Acton, p. 97.

and students, and asked to be allowed to join them. When they were led from the motors and lined up in front of the executioners, one of the latter laid hold of a priest's habit and shouted, "That's what we are killing you for!" whereupon he answered, "That's what we are glad to die for."³² Radiance and joy are the hall-marks of martyrdom from the days of Trajan and Nero, through the centuries, down to the martyrs that we of the twentieth century are privileged to stand beside in the near proximity of Soviet Russia and Soviet Spain. The record of those radiant young Claretian martyrs, going glad and fearless to "give their bodies for God's sake to death", last August, is but the glorious reiteration of the martyrdoms of which Eusebius tells us, "I have seen a youth of scarcely twenty years, standing unbound, his arms extended like a cross, intrepid and fearless, absorbed in prayer to God"; of the joy in the faces of the proto-martyrs of Tudor England of whom St. Thomas More said, looking down on their hurdles dragged beneath his prison window, "See these blessed Fathers be now as cheerfully going to their deaths as bridegrooms to their marriage"; of the "bold and joyous" martyrs of Soviet Russia who, their faces "lit by a glow of supernatural fire", as an eye-witness describes, confounded the Soviet judges by the "divine energy of those who believe in the Christ of God". Surely the Holy Father had these Claretian martyrs of Barbastro especially in mind when he spoke to the great gathering of refugees from Spain, on the Feast of the Exaltation of Holy Cross last September, acclaiming the heroism of the new Spanish martyrdoms: "martyrdom in the full, sacred, and glorious meaning of the word; of the sacrifice of lives the most innocent, of those venerable with age, of youth in its first flower, of many so bold and generous as to ask for a place among the victims who were being carried to the place where the executioners awaited them".* *Salvete flores martyrurum!*

Early in September another uncensored dispatch in *The Times* continues the description of Madrid under *Frente Popular* Communist rule: "The Unions and

* Speech by Pope Pius XI, Holy Rood Day, 1936.

Syndicates, or whoever issues orders to armed men not of the police, continue to arrest, judge, and execute. Although many of the executions in the capital are clandestine . . . in other cases guards remain on duty, pistol on hip, smoking near the victims exposed to public view. Slips of paper bearing a rubber stamp and a number are pinned to the breasts of some of the dead—the mark of the Popular Tribunal. These exhibitions of the justice of the people would have less horror were the guards to prevent the gathering crowds from closing on the bodies like buzzing flies. The dignity of death is denied to the dead. The same execution sites are used time and again. The bodies lie where they fall—at the foot of walls, along the sides of deep cuttings, through the baked earth in new streets not yet built up, or in the open. People living near these spots hear the volleys, sometimes also cries for mercy, or the moan of one whom the *coup de grâce* in the dark has failed to deliver from agony. Many a silent prayer goes up in the night for the victims.”³³ A later uncensored dispatch in *The Times* mentions that the open butchery at well-known “execution-grounds” all over Madrid had been checked; but only in favour of less obtrusive methods, the victims being “no longer shot near by, or left on view, but conveyed in a van or car some distance away. Identification has become more difficult, and relatives are deprived even of the consolation of giving their dead decent burial”.³⁴

September brought further accounts of what happens to a people when “the mass is armed”. This is what life was like in Malaga under the combined Anarchist-Communist régime. The slaughter of inhabitants “not openly allied to the Workers’ Cause” was systematized into “petty killings” and “organized killings”. The “petty killing” was the shooting through the head, in a convenient spot, of anyone with whom the shooter had a private quarrel. The “organized killings” were conducted by one or other of the innumerable “safety committees” who went the rounds of the prisons, and took forty or fifty victims out daily and shot them, sometimes near the cemetery, sometimes in the business quarter of the city. The bodies were left for hours before

"burial-lorries" removed them to pits on the outskirts of Malaga. Youths under sixteen years of age were shot summarily because they had dared to vote against Communism. Further, complete chaos prevailed in the administration of Malaga owing to the lack of co-operation between the many self-appointed committees composed of "workers", to control every phase of daily life. No one was able to move without the assent of one or other of these bodies. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Malaga, last September, showed itself to be completely destructive of individual liberty.³⁵

The month closed with an increase of the Terror exercised inside Madrid. In an uncensored dispatch of 26 September, the *Times* correspondent stated that "daily executions—on one day there were eighty—continue in Madrid. . . . The ghastly array in the morgue has been made more horrible by the bodies of murdered women. One was the Marquesa de Silvela, wife of the Marques, who with his younger brother was taken from his house and shot some time ago. He was the eldest son of the Liberal Prime Minister Don Francisco Silvela. . . . The other, Señora de Aldama, was shot because she would not reveal where her husband and son were hiding. . . . It is still sufficient for the accused to be a nobleman or a priest to be condemned to death".³⁶ In the last week of September the news was received that at Fuenteovijuna in Cordova a number of friars were ordered to utter blasphemies; on refusing, they were tortured and shot. Again, the martyrs of twentieth-century Spain are one in spirit with the martyrs of the second century. "Curse Christ and I will release you", said the Proconsul to St. Polycarp. "Eighty-six years have I served Him," replied the Bishop, "and He has done me nothing but good. How then can I curse Him?" And Polycarp was burnt alive.

Students of Lenin's "manual of action" are well aware that this master of the art of revolution constantly insisted on the necessity of arming the masses. "*In the first place,*" Lenin wrote, "*the Soviets give expression to the armed strength of the Workers.*"* We have seen that

* *Preparing for Revolt*, Lenin, p. 185.

already, in September, in Madrid the masses were armed. We have seen something of the Terror that ensued. Early in October the death statistics had increased to 120 people killed by "murder squads" in Madrid in one day.³⁷ The prisons could not hold the thousands tracked down and arrested. "Many whose crime was to belong to a perfectly legal political party dare not show their faces. These include members of the upper classes of well-known Liberal sympathies."³⁸ Nuns were dragged out, one by one, from places of hiding. The two young sisters of the Uruguayan Vice-Consul were taken out of Madrid, and shot on the Aragon road, together with a nun whom they were befriending. The three bodies were found lying by the road next day; the body of the younger Señorita de Aguiar was bruised, the clothes torn and disordered, and the head terribly disfigured.³⁸ Moreover, the Terror in Madrid, as in all the districts of Spain under Communist control, was not merely physical. As the *Times* correspondent, in his uncensored dispatch of 6 October, finely phrased it, many citizens "have hungered spiritually for nine long weeks. Anti-Christ has been given a long-awaited opportunity".³⁸

The impotence of a so-called democratic Government when in co-operation with Communists is very clearly displayed in this uncensored dispatch: "Men who had been advised by Ministers in Office to give themselves up, as the safest course to pursue, have paid with their lives for trusting such authority. They have been torn from the custody of the police, and shot out of hand, without trial."³⁸ There seems no pity", the *Times* dispatch concludes, echoing unconsciously those words of the Communist leader La Passionaria: "There can be neither pity nor compassion." In Catalonia a Tribunal was erected, by the Communist Andres Nin, having as its first object "to guarantee the integrity of proletarian conquests". Sentences, said Andres Nin, "must be without appeal, for weakness would be the death of the revolution"—a sentence of great interest, proving, as it does, that the Communist assault in Spain is not a defence against Fascist invaders but an internal "revolution". One of the offences specially designated for

this Catalanian Tribunal is "the holding of sentiments which dishonour revolution".³⁹ The man in the street is left wondering what sentiments can possibly "dishonour" a revolution which from the first July days of its existence has been marked by wholesale murder, and by the destruction not only of churches but also of buildings and objects of the highest historic value.

The last two months of the year show the same Terror at work wherever Communist control has been established in Spain. The same desecrations—as in the church at Alcola where Mr. Rupert Belleville saw a statue of Our Lady with the Communist emblem of the hammer and sickle painted across it; blasphemous and filthy inscriptions all over the walls; and, outside, the priest lying dead, "mutilated with the savagery of a homicidal maniac".⁴⁰ The same mass slaughter of priests reported—forty of the teaching order of the Salesians killed, thirty-four killed of the nursing fraternity of the Brothers of St. John of God, fifty Franciscans massacred in a single monastery, 450 priests killed in the Archdiocese of Toledo, nine priests and thirty-two nuns shot in Valencia (the seat of the Spanish Government) on 11 November—the lists are unending. One outstanding incident is the shooting, recorded on 30 October, of every one of the students at the Salesian school at Astudillo; the average age of these boy victims was fifteen.⁴¹ Side by side with the persistent killing of the religious, priests, nuns, and pupils, the slaughter of the civil population was continued. From July to December a single resident in Madrid had counted over 125 corpses (of those killed by persons in Madrid) within sight of his hall door. During the first week of November, as an uncensored dispatch in *The Times* reports, the walls of the Retiro Park in Madrid "were lined with corpses, and corpses also reappeared at the extremities of avenues, and even in some of the streets". This uncensored message is quite explicit as to the motive power controlling present conditions in Spain. Madrid, we read, "is inundated with Moscow posters, to which Spanish captions have been set, plastering the walls, while the cinemas give endless series of Communist films".⁴² And

the dispatch adds that Madrid today is the biggest experiment "Communism has ever raised in the West". What is true of Madrid is true of Spain. The Communist control in Spain, in 1936, is an experiment that can be studied with the greatest profit by all nations.

G. M. GODDEN.

- ¹ Attested by Don Arias de Reina and Don Rivas Guvillo of Arrahal.
- ² Attested by J. C. Piedra, F. L. de Rosas, N. S. Marquez, J. G. Lopez of Aznalcollar.
- ³ Attested by A. L. Martin, F. J. Martin, A. F. Leal of La Campana.
- ⁴ Attested by Feliz Corrlia, Rua duz Soviano, 44, Lisbon.
- ⁵ Attested by P. J. Cordon, F. H. de Llera, E. C. Fernandez, J. M. Real, M. C. de Espinosa, in the presence of the Portuguese Consul, Badajoz.
- ⁶ Attested by Don José M. del Olmo, President of the Municipal Commission, and José C. Alvaroz, Constantina.
- ⁷ Attested by the Mayor of Escalona, Don Esteban Garcia.
- ⁸ Attested by Don Eugenio Martin, Magistrate, Lora ; and C. C. Granados and J. M. Linon, both of Lora.
- ⁹ Attested by Don Carlos M. Morales of Palma del Condado.
- ¹⁰ Attested by Don Ramos Franco and J. B. Camacho of Posadas.
- ¹¹ Attested by J. A. Reina, L. Sicilia, F. V. Giminez, J. G. Bailon, J. R. Zurita.
- ¹² *Official Report of Communist Atrocities in Southern Spain*, II, p. 8.
- ¹³ Attested by M. C. Jiminez of Baena.
- ¹⁴ Attested by Municipal officials of Belmetz, J. B. Dominguez and J. C. Moreno.
- ¹⁵ *The Times*, 24 July, 1936.
- ¹⁶ *The Times*, 24 July, 1936.
- ¹⁷ *The Times*, 1 August, 1936.
- ¹⁸ Eye-witness in Barcelona, *Universe*, 31 July, 1936.
- ¹⁹ Mrs. Beach, c/o *Universe*, 184 Strand, London.
- ²⁰ Mr. G. O. Howard, c/o W. J. Howard, Esq., Cranworth Gardens, London, S.W.
- ²¹ Report by eye-witnesses, *Official Report of Communist Atrocities in Southern Spain*, II, p. 23.
- ²² *The Times*, 25 July, 1936.
- ²³ Reuter, quoted in the *Evening Standard*, 25 July, 1936.
- ²⁴ *The Times*, 27 July, 1936, citing a British eye-witness.
- ²⁵ Statement from an Englishman in Madrid, c/o *Universe*.
- ²⁶ M. Paul Lesourd, *Figaro*, 12 August, 1936.
- ²⁷ Visitor to Valencia, *Universe*, 14 August, 1936.
- ²⁸ Mr. Bernard Malley, *Universe*, 14 August, 1936.
- ²⁹ Report of the sole survivor, Father Vicario, *Universe*, 28 August, 1936.
- ³⁰ Mr. H. A. Fox, *Universe*, 21 August, 1936.
- ³¹ Uncensored dispatch, *The Times*, 25 August, 1936.
- ³² Report by two Argentine Fathers, sole survivors, *Universe*, 4 September, 1936.
- ³³ Uncensored dispatch, *The Times*, 12 September, 1936.
- ³⁴ Uncensored dispatch, *The Times*, 9 November, 1936.
- ³⁵ Reports from refugees, Gibraltar, *Daily Telegraph*, 18 September, 1936.
- ³⁶ Uncensored dispatch, *The Times*, 30 September, 1936.
- ³⁷ Uncensored dispatch, *The Times*, 3 October, 1936.
- ³⁸ Uncensored dispatch, *The Times*, 6 October, 1936.
- ³⁹ *The Times*, 21 October, 1936.
- ⁴⁰ Report by Mr. Rupert Bellville, eye-witness, *Catholic Times*, 16 October, 1936.
- ⁴¹ *Osservatore Romano*, 22 October, 1936.
- ⁴² Uncensored dispatch, *The Times*, 21 November, 1936.

GENERAL FRANCO'S NEW SPAIN

COMPELLED by conscience as are those of us who have made a long and special study of Spain to define, at least to ourselves, our attitude to the Spanish conflict, we find ourselves obliged to make a decision on each of three questions: the degree of responsibility which each side must share for the outbreak of the war; the record of each side in the conduct of the war; and the future which each side holds out for Spain in the event of its complete victory.

It is one aspect of the last of these questions which I propose now to discuss. In order to predict the future of Spain if the Valencia Government wins, we have to rely largely on observation and imagination. We can see what has happened in Catalonia, where the Army was defeated in forty-eight hours and the "Proletarian Revolution" (as the new régime is freely and openly termed by its supporters) established without further resistance. One is tempted at first to suppose that, in the event of a Red victory, a similar revolution would triumph, and a similar collectivist State be set up in Spain as a whole. But it must be remembered that in Catalonia, as elsewhere in Red Spain, the imminence of attack by the common enemy has held together, within the Popular Front, groups which are antithetical in ideology and have for months been carrying on a kind of underground warfare. Once the strain was removed, the Socialists and Communists, on the one hand, and the Syndicalists and Anarchists, on the other, would be free to dispute the definitive direction for the Proletarian Revolution to take; since the workers on both sides would be fully armed, and Soviet Russia would presumably intervene in favour of one of them, it is not difficult to predict either the nature and the eventual result of the new Civil War or the degree of bloodshed and disruption that would mark its troublous course.

My concern in this article, however, is with the probable future of Spain in the event of the victory of General Franco, a subject upon which reliable information has been made available by the Spanish Press, though it has

not been widely circulated in this country. It is remarkable that there are writers normally quite well informed who seem not to know of it. Thus an ex-Minister and the leader of the Lliga Catalana, Don Francisco Cambó, remarks in an able article in the *Daily Telegraph* (29 December, 1936): "I cannot say—no one can say—what form of government will be established in Spain if the movement headed by General Franco is successful." On the contrary, if official and semi-official pronouncements have any meaning, we can say it with little fear of being mistaken, for the General himself has described with some fullness the new Spain which he proposes to inaugurate. The principal sources for our information are two broadcasts by General Franco—one from Burgos on the night (1 October, 1936) of his proclamation as Chief of State; the other from Salamanca on 19 January, 1937—and one by General Mola dated 28 January, 1937.* Other sources are decrees issued and interviews given by the Generalissimo—somewhat less reliable, no doubt, than these, but more so than uninspired and unsigned newspaper articles. The whole of the available material gives an interesting panorama of the new Spain, with inevitable gaps which no doubt will be filled in later.

Each of the three broadcasts presents us with a not unattractive picture of tomorrow against a carefully drawn background of yesterday and today. Spain has long been suffering from a "current of mistaken intellectualism which despised all that stood for truly national thought and harboured preferences for all eccentricities conceived abroad" (B). Enthusiasm for Soviet doctrines, a "furious" Socialism, a deformation of Spanish history—all this, we are told, contributed to the decline of patriotism in Spain. At the same time Spain's commercial prosperity turned to adversity, while false prophets poisoned the air with promises of "the land for the peasant, supreme power for the worker and political autonomy for the regions" (B).

* These will be referred to in parentheses as B, S, and M respectively. I am indebted to the Editor of the Seville edition of *A.B.C.* for providing me with the text of each of these broadcasts. The Spanish text of the first-named will be found in the *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* for January, 1937.

"Secret pacts with Russian Communism, secret agreements with foreign nations behind the back of the constitution and the laws; ceaseless persecution of all that represented spiritual values . . . That was the Spain of yesterday: the Spain of workers criminally exploited by directors; of consumptives without sanatoria; of hearths without fires; of the notorious party bosses; of social injustice; of forests without trees; of children without schools; of Spaniards without a country; of men without God." (S.)

All this is perhaps a little too much like an election address to prepossess one in favour of what comes next. The expository part of the Burgos broadcast, however, is more satisfactory than the oratorical. It postulates a "broad totalitarian conception" of the new Spain, which is to be carried into practice "by means of those national institutions which will assure its totality, unity and continuity" (B). The municipalities, it seems from both the Burgos and the Salamanca broadcasts, are to play an important part in the administrative machinery of the State, the principal wheels of which (declares the Salamanca speech with a somewhat vague comprehensiveness) are to be "family, laws, corporations, municipalities, provinces, regions". The government of this totalitarian State will be military in character and accompanied by stern methods of repression such as are necessary to guarantee the "regular functioning of the complex forces of the country" (B). A beginning was made with organization on the very day of the Burgos broadcast by the creation of a "Technical Committee of State", corresponding to a Cabinet, with its own President, and made up of sub-committees corresponding to ministries and dealing respectively with Finance, Justice, Commerce and Industry, Agriculture, Labour, Culture and Education, and Public Works and Communications. Each of the occupied provinces was given a Governor-General, and foreign policy was entrusted to a special "Secretariat of Foreign Relations", of which one division was to concern itself with the Press and with propaganda.

"The peculiarity of each region", continues the Burgos

broadcast, "will be respected", but "according to the old national tradition" and "without in any way detracting from the complete unity of the country". No further explanation is given of what this means, but it is widely interpreted by the Press as indicating a return of the most rigid centralization and the cancellation of the Statutes of Autonomy conceded to Catalonia under the Second Republic and to Euzkadi last October. In our "united and sovereign Spain", declares General Mola, while each of the regions will "keep its individuality", there will be no "grotesque caricatures of government", "like those we see at present in Catalonia and Vizcaya" (M). No plebiscite on such a question, or indeed on any question, is likely to be taken, for General Franco considers that popular suffrage has become completely discredited—first through the action of the party bosses, and later by the Syndicates; the will of the people is therefore to find some other way of expression which is only hinted at. I cannot myself pretend to any enthusiasm for a totalitarian State, a régime of repression and the abolition of Home Rule in two regions in which huge majorities of the inhabitants have voted for it. But if this régime comes into force it must be hoped that, as time goes on, some modification of it may be found possible which will unite all parties in loyalty and allow persons with different political views to live together in peace. The most serious objection that can be raised to General Franco's exposition is that it foreshadows no such possibility. Yet most people will agree that, after such a convulsion as Spain is suffering and seems likely for some time to continue to suffer, normal methods of government will for a considerable period be impracticable.

The next passage in the Burgos broadcast contains what is perhaps the most striking feature of General Franco's scheme and one which few could have expected to find in it. Opponents of the Nationalist cause maintain that the *movimiento nacional* is merely an attempt to oppress the working classes, to maintain the rich in idleness, and to re-establish feudalism and tyranny of Church and aristocracy. But General Franco, with his chief

lieutenants, has been at the greatest pains to assert the contrary. His very first words as Chief of State, spoken on 1 October, 1936, to the people of Burgos from the balcony of the Capitanía General immediately after his investiture, contained the following passage :

"We come to belong to the people ; we come for the humble, for the middle classes, not for the capitalists. Our task demands the sacrifice of all, but principally of those who have most in favour of those who have nothing. We are most anxious [*tenemos vivo empeño*] that there shall be no hearth without a fire, no home without bread. We shall pursue to a successful issue the sacred task of a social reform self-imposed with good will, and we shall demand from all the fulfilment of their duties."*

That, no doubt, is only the statement of an ideal, and little information is available as to the method by which the ideal is to be realized, but, if we can believe anything, we must believe in the sincerity of General Franco's desire to exalt work and to improve the lot of the worker. A few quotations will illustrate this.

"Labour will . . . not be the slave of capitalism nor will it be organized on a class basis. . . . The worker shall be assured of his wages and, until formulae shall have been decreed with reference to salaries and to the participation of the workers in the benefits of production, all such advances shall be respected as imply amelioration of labour for society and for the national economy." (B.)

"The State will organize taxation in such a way that taxes fall chiefly upon those who are economically able to bear them." (B.)

"As regards agriculture, without applying formulae which are capable only of hypothetical conception, the activity of the State will be constantly directed towards aiding the independence of the peasant and caring especially for his well-being." (B.)

* A.B.C., Seville, 2 October, 1936.

"The new Spain will represent the great family of the nation, without masters and vassals, without poor and without potentates. Social justice shall be the foundation of our new Empire, with no suicidal and destructive class strife." (S.)

"We aspire to the real and effective betterment of those who suffer, to a progressive and rapid remedying of the state of desolation in which they find themselves, for Spain is large enough and rich enough to gather all into her bosom and for all to have a larger share in the enjoyment of her wealth: and this wealth must be defended and increased by peace and collaboration between all social classes." (S.)

"Those of us who have lived in contact with the working masses . . . those of us who have not scorned the worker's horny hand and have grasped it warmly when he has offered his life for Spain, know and understand the people." (S.)

"We shall create industry; we shall intensify production in our mines and the transformation of their products; we shall solve land problems; and we shall see that, either willingly or by compulsion, the 'haves' share their substance with the 'have-nots'." (M.)

"We must wipe out all differences and all rancour between employers and workers; we must secure a complete and perfect degree of collaboration between them, for nothing permanent can be built upon quicksands battered by the sea. There must be real and continuous harmony between labour and capital." (Broadcast of General Queipo de Llano, 12 February, 1937.)

But the workers are not to have rights without duties. Idleness is to be banished from the country and all must be prepared to labour for the common weal. It is a good omen that General Franco abhors the parasite.

"Side by side with these rights which we recognize as pertaining to the workers will go their duties and obligations, especially all that are implied in loyal combination for the production of wealth." (B.)

"All Spaniards without exception will be obliged to work: the new State cannot maintain citizens who are parasites." (B.)

"We desire a fraternal Spain, a laborious and industrious Spain, a Spain in which parasites will find no home." (S.)

From the scanty information which we have upon the legislation already decreed in the occupied provinces, some small idea can be gained of the lines which General Franco will be likely to follow in the event of his triumph. Strikes and lock-outs have been declared illegal; benefits have been granted to the unemployed, to the families of combatants, and to the necessitous everywhere, and free treatment has been given to needy sufferers from tuberculosis.* These are war-time measures, and there is every reason to hope that they will be greatly amplified and increased in number if victory comes to General Franco with peace.

In connexion with the worker, we think at once of education. What does General Franco say in his official and semi-official broadcasts about education? It gives one a slight shock to find that he says nothing. Yet Spain's future rests almost entirely upon the educational schemes which are made for her now. Some ominous remarks have been dropped by General Franco and General Millán-Astray about "intellectuals"—not, it must be admitted, without great provocation; let us hope that we may speedily be reassured on this part of General Franco's programme. At present all we know is that General Mola has made the following promise:

"We shall organize schools in which the teachers will inculcate love of God and of our native land.

* A summary of part of this legislation will be found in the *Seville A.B.C.* for 12 February, 1937, p. 11.

We shall give a new prestige to University education, putting a stop to the activities of professors who make use of their Chairs to stab in the back the very State which pays them." (M.)

But this, unfortunately, takes us very little farther.

Another respect in which the New Spain seems likely to belie prophecy is in relation to the Church. It is "not to be confessional", but a fresh Concordat will be made with the Catholic Church, which will "respect the national tradition and the religious feelings of the huge majority of Spaniards" (B). Though "the Church is to remain separated from the State, since this is in the interests of both, it must be understood that this separation does not imply divorce, but is rather the outward form of a close spiritual partnership. Spain, thank God, has never ceased to be Catholic and never will" (M). "To the bitter Marxist and Communist persecution of everything that represents spirituality, faith and worship, we oppose the sentiment of a Catholic Spain, with her saints and her martyrs, with her age-old institutions, her social justice, her Christian charity, and her great comprehensive spirit." (S.)

There is to be no religious intolerance or persecution in the New Spain. "We are Catholics, but we respect the religious beliefs of those who are not." That is an absolutely plain and straightforward statement. It will be unwelcome to enemies of the Spanish Church, who have helped to spread tales widely current of the persecution and murder, by Nationalists, of Protestant pastors—tales which are proved false almost as soon as they are uttered. But there is no valid reason to refuse it credence. If the war has taught us anything, it is that only if General Franco wins is there the least hope of religious liberty in Spain.

Next come the relations of Spain with other countries. If there is one thing which General Franco has asserted more frequently and consistently than another, it is that under no circumstances will any part of Spain ever be ceded to another country. No number of such assertions, presumably, will convince those who have already made

up their minds to the contrary, but from the first, both in broadcasts and in published official announcements, the Generalissimo has made this perfectly clear. "Not a foot of Spanish territory", he has promised, "will we make over to any foreign Power." "Neither Nationalist Spain nor its leader", declares General Mola, "will ever endure that either in our own country or in its possessions and protectorates the will of any others than Spaniards shall prevail nor any other interest than the supreme interest of the *Patria*. Is that clear?" (M.)

It certainly should be. And General Franco carries the matter a little further. "As to commerce, we shall live in harmony with other peoples, giving preference to nations of related race, language or ideology." "Only Sovietic contacts will be excluded, since these would be so prejudicial to our civilization and society." (B.)

In an interview given to a representative of the Argentine paper *La Nación*,* General Franco goes into still greater detail on the foreign relations of the New Spain. Many commentators—some friendly and some critical—have assumed that a totalitarian Spain would follow the tradition of isolation, and occupy herself, mainly if not entirely, with internal reconstruction. This supposition, it appears, is unjustified. "The New Spain will take her proper place in Europe—a place very different from that which she occupied recently. For many years past . . . the principal concern of not a few Spanish politicians has been the avoidance of intervention in international questions. But Spain, because of her history, her geographical position and her world interests, has a call to intervene in these questions, provided they affect her in any way, and she will do so in future." A declaration of this kind, of course, at once raises misgivings as to the relations which will exist between Spain, Italy, Germany, and the other Powers—misgivings which are not allayed by General Mola's suggestion of the possibility of an alliance with the Fascist Powers. While a desire for peace, he says, will be uppermost in the minds of Spain's new leaders, no one must deny them the

* A.B.C., 15 October, 1936. Reprinted in the *Journal of the Institute of Hispanic Studies*, January, 1937.

right to be moved by an attachment—"romantic, if you like, but natural"—to "those nations which gave us their support in this sacred crusade against Communism and anarchy and felt for us in our troubles as though they were their own" (M). But there is to be no question of Spain's obeying the dictates of other Powers. "Within our own frontiers we will be kings and masters and we will no more allow ourselves to be talked round or influenced or imposed upon than we do today. We will have Spain free." (M.) In order to ensure and maintain this freedom, he continues, the Nationalist Government will create a modest but strong and efficient Army, Navy, and Air Force, and will make any necessary sacrifices for "the absolute independence of the nation, the free Spain which we all desire".

Finally, it should be added that all the documents before us insist upon the tolerance which the New Spain will accord to all who conform to its principles and respect its laws. This, of course, has been an assurance frequently given by the Nationalist leaders during the war, and they claim that, even during hostilities, they have treated combatant prisoners, as well as non-combatants, well, and visited punishment only upon those who have committed acts of violence. General Franco repeats this assurance and this claim in the clearest and most emphatic terms :

"Those who have not been with us from the beginning have no need to fear, nor have those who, misled by propaganda, have taken the side of the Red hordes or even joined their ranks. I guarantee that the lives of all who surrender to our troops in good faith will be respected, and the tribunals of justice will examine responsibility for acts of cruelty or crimes committed in the course of the bloody Red revolution.

"We shall forge a new Spain for all and we shall not close the doors of the new State to any who approach them without reserve and without perverse intentions, for we know that from out of the masses who have been exploited and deceived will come one day the most enthusiastic defenders of the new Spain.

"Peace and justice are what we offer to Spaniards, and the sooner they are accepted, the more rapidly will the country regain the rhythm of progress." (S.)

In this brief synthesis, I have of set purpose refrained from more than the slightest of commentaries, and allowed the leaders of Nationalist Spain to speak for themselves. Detailed criticism of their proposals seems to me at the present time inappropriate and premature, for the proposals have been only lightly sketched and a hundred questions which occur to us as we read them remain unanswered. But it is to the good that such indications of future policy as the Nationalist leaders have given, which the British Press has passed over almost in silence, should be generally known, for too much criticism since the Civil War began has been based upon imagination and prejudice, and where important documents of any kind exist they should be made public.

E. ALLISON PEERS.

THE CHURCH IN GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

EUROPE is again experiencing wars of religion. For although the physical warfare which is devastating Spain, and the ideological struggle which is agitating the Germanic world, are political in form, they are religious in essence. In Spain the fight is between Catholic Spanish Nationalism, and International Bolshevik Agnosticism. In Germany and Austria it is between the Neo-Paganism of National Socialism and Christianity. Thus the Catholic Church is compelled to fight on two fronts at the same time. It is the purpose of this article to make an attempt to explain something of the Church's fight on one of these fronts—the Christian front in the Germanic world. I propose, therefore, to examine developments in Central Europe—that is to say, in Germany and Austria and the Danubian Basin—and in particular the relations between the two Germanic States—the German Reich and Austria—in the light of the religious war. This may, perhaps, help to clarify for British Catholic readers some of those Central European problems which continue to threaten the peace and stability of Europe as a whole.

The subject involves a number of questions of a political nature which, although not in themselves directly connected with spiritual matters, are nevertheless factors in the basic religious struggle, and which at the same time influence and are influenced by the fundamentals of the religious issues at stake.

In Hitler's Germany, the struggle between radical National Socialism and the Catholic Church for the Germanic soul is now entering upon a new and critical phase. It is the phase of the final and open challenge of Neo-Paganism, as represented by the National Socialist totalitarian ideology, to the German Christian tradition. This is not a new *Kulturkampf* which has appeared suddenly overnight. It is the latest move in a campaign which was thought out, in all its various stages, from the very beginning of the Nazi Régime. There have been advances and retreats, and compromise by the way, according to circumstance and the dictates of expediency.

But the final aim—the elimination of the Christian idea from German life—has been kept steadily in view. During recent weeks the advance towards the realization of this aim has been more rapid than ever before.

The attack on Christianity in Germany has not, of course, been confined to the Catholic Church. The Lutheran Church has also been attacked. It is, indeed, one of the few heartening aspects of a dark and dismal story that both Catholic and Protestant have at different times put up a strong resistance. During recent months there has been more than one instance in which Christian crowds of both denominations have stood shoulder to shoulder and displayed an admirable courage in resisting the desecrations of Nazi Storm Troopers. It is interesting to note, however, that whereas in Germany both the Catholics and the Lutherans are attacked by the National Socialist State, in Austria Nazism makes use of Lutherism as a politico-religious weapon against the present Catholic régime of that country. I will deal with this more fully when I come to consider the Austro-German aspect of the situation.

In the early days of the Hitlerist Régime the technique was to pacify the bishops by the negotiation of the Concordat between Hitlerist Germany and the Vatican. On paper, at least, it looked a fairly satisfactory sort of compromise. The Church on her part had agreed to give up "political Catholicism"—the Centre Party disappeared and the priesthood withdrew from political life—and the Régime on its part agreed to the provisions in the Concordat guaranteeing the rights of the Church in the matter both of schools and of youth organizations.

The Concordat was a manœuvre rather than a reality. It sought to gain time, and also to mask the real intentions of the Nazis. For they never meant to abide by it. This is fully confirmed by a recent article in the official Nazi organ *Völkischer Beobachter*, which says cynically that it is now high time for the Concordat—which has never been kept by the State—to be "reformed" (i.e. whittled away). The masking tactics of the Nazis in the early stages are very well brought out in a closely reasoned article in a recent issue of the Austrian Catholic

review *Christliche Ständestaat*. The writer, Dr. Walde-mar Gurian, the author of a book entitled *The Fight for the Church in the Third Reich*, points out that the negotiation of the Concordat served to distract attention from the real anti-religious intentions of the régime, so that such anti-religious manifestations as the dissolution of the "Gesellentag" (organization of Catholic craftsmen in the transition stage between apprenticeship and master-craftsmanship) created less apprehension than might otherwise have been the case. Likewise, the full implications of Culture-Leader Rosenberg's anti-Christian book, *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* (which has been placed on the Index by the Vatican), were not taken with sufficient seriousness.

The very most was made by the Nazi Régime of the Bolshevik menace; and many German Catholics were inclined to believe that Herr Hitler, by saving Germany from Communism, had saved priests from being killed and churches from being burnt down by the Bolsheviks. Given the circumstances and the atmosphere at the time, it is not surprising that a large number of Catholics hoped that with the banning of Marxism—and, therefore, they thought, Marxist Agnosticism—a great new era of Christianity in Germany was about to begin. Hence they were willing enough to make a few renunciations here and to agree to a few reforms there. As the writer in the *Christliche Ständestaat* truly says, "National Socialism always tries to lull its adversaries to sleep". Thus induced to believe that the fundamentals of their Church would not be attacked, the Catholic community acquiesced in a number of things which, had they but known it, were really the thin edge of the wedge. By raising false hopes the Nazis were able to bring about a partial spiritual demobilization. The able propagandists of the Régime set to work to suggest to the Catholics that hitherto they had been too one-sided in their political outlook. It would be better, they hinted, to take away from the Church tasks which were not strictly within her province, so that she would be better able to devote herself exclusively to her spiritual mission.

This led to an era of compromise. Catholics sought

what was good in the Régime, whilst continuing to reject what was patently bad. The attack on the Church was, moreover, slowed down just prior to the plebiscite in the Saar. The Saar Catholics proved themselves to be loyal Germans and, under the guidance of their bishops and priests, accordingly voted for the return of the Saar to the Reich. After the Saar affair, the attacks on the Church were renewed. The era of compromise, however, continued, with intermittent protests from the Hierarchy. In this connexion too high a tribute cannot be paid to that great man and noble Christian, Cardinal Faulhaber, who, from his Munich headquarters, has all through never hesitated to speak out fearlessly, and whose courage has invariably been supported by the acclamations of the Bavarian faithful. The writing on the wall, however, soon became plain for all to see. It will be remembered that new Press laws were introduced which liquidated the Catholic Press; that monasteries and convents were accused of immoral practices; priests and nuns arrested for currency-smuggling; Catholic deputations to the Holy Father belaboured upon their return to Germany; priests and teachers imprisoned (taken into "protective custody") on accusations of Communist activities; Catholic youth organizations suppressed; and Catholic parents pressed not to send their children to the Catholic schools. (There may, perhaps, have been some truth, in one or two individual cases, in regard to currency-smuggling, although it clearly did not take place on anything like the scale suggested by the Nazis. The accusations of Communist activity and of immorality may be dismissed as Nazi inventions.)

I am recapitulating these past events, in some detail, because some of the points at issue—such as the breaking of the Concordat by the Government in regard to the youth organizations and the schools—are at present the subject of discussions between the Hierarchy and the Régime. The Concordat expressly safeguarded in theory both the Catholic Youth Movement and the Catholic schools. The Régime has definitely undermined these safeguards in practice. The methods employed have

been ingenious in their simplicity. Unless boys belong to the Hitler Youth Movement they will not be able to obtain jobs. Unless their parents voted, in the recent plebiscites, for sending their children to the Nazi schools instead of the Confessional schools, they would be discriminated against. By means of pressure of this kind the authorities were able to obtain a "vote" from the harassed parents which gave a false appearance of popular support to these anti-clerical moves.

Baldur von Schirach, the Nazi Youth Leader, is positively anti-clerical. The Catholic youths thus pressed into his youth organizations are brought up in an atmosphere in which the State and the Party are deified at the expense of religion. The authorities, of course, deny this. They still maintain that they are not against Catholicism, but only against "political" Catholicism; but as political Catholicism disappeared in Germany in the early days of the National Socialist Régime, it is clear that the fight now is against Catholicism itself. The Catholic bishops have, from time to time, issued episcopal letters of protest. These are not allowed to be published in the daily Press. Thus large sections of the public are unaware that the Archbishop of Freiburg, Mgr. Gröber, who was full of hope in 1935, is saying now that he fears Germany will soon have "Mexican conditions". Last year a letter signed by practically all the leading Catholic German bishops protested strongly against the persecution of Catholics by the Nazis. More especially the bishops were concerned to point out the injustice of accusing Catholic priests of Communist activities, when, they declared, the Church was known to be the strongest opponent of Communism.

There was some hope, towards the end of last year, that on the basis of a common anti-Communist front Church and State in Germany might perhaps be able to compose their differences. These hopes were dispelled by the beginning of the year. This caused the Holy Father to call to Rome a number of German bishops in conference. An atmosphere of disappointment, anxiety, and gloom settled on their deliberations. The era of compromise had failed. The intermittent protests of

the Hierarchy had passed unheeded. An accommodation based on an allied anti-Communist crusade had failed to materialize. It was necessary for the Catholic Hierarchy in Germany to fight again in the "trenches" of the religious war in Germany. Thus it came about that that doughty front-line fighter, Cardinal Faulhaber, again has gone "over the top". I refer to his fearless denunciation at Munich a short time ago of the Government's hypocrisy in regard to the Concordat, and his more recent direct conversations with Herr Hitler on the subject.

The Church authorities in Germany, and their brethren in Austria, are now fully alive to the seriousness of the situation. They are especially alarmed, it is said, by the deflexions from the Church in South Germany of Catholics who have felt that the resistance to the Government's de-Christianizing activities was not as strong as it should have been. It is very difficult, however, to arrive at any positive estimate as to how far this is true. What is quite clear is that critics are not lacking in the Catholic world, both in Germany and Austria, of the policy of compromise and hoping for the best (and more especially the policy of seeking an accommodation with Nazism on the strength of common anti-Bolshevist aims). In the article in the *Christliche Ständestaat*, to which I have already referred, the view is expressed that the attitude of compromise was incompatible with the "missionary aspirations" of the Church to have a modifying effect upon National Socialism. "National Socialism and Christianity are incompatible", the article roundly asserts, and adds that the sort of Catholicism which adopts a negative attitude towards National Socialism is lacking in courage and bound to be exploited for propagandist purposes by its Nazi persecutors, who, having thus used the Church, will then throw her contemptuously aside.

These criticisms, coming from Catholic Austria, are sincere enough, but the spirit of compromise which they thus indict has not by any means been entirely lacking in Austria either. The period when compromise was tried in Germany corresponds with a similar period in Austria, at least as far as certain elements in the Catholic world

there were concerned. In Austria the Catholic world has by no means been so united as outward appearances would suggest. Cardinal Innitzer, the Primate, has of course never flinched in his support of Austrian independence as being the indispensable rallying point for all German Catholicism, and the only possible way of preserving Austria's own special individuality. The great majority of the Austrian Hierarchy take the same view. On the other hand there is Mgr. Hudal, who has sought to build a bridge between the Catholic Church and National Socialism.

Amongst the political clerical party, the followers of Chancellor Schuschnigg, the majority stands for the preservation of Austrian independence both on political and religious grounds. Certain elements, however—such as, for instance, Dr. Funder, the Editor of the Catholic and semi-official *Reichspost*—have essayed the path of compromise.

During the time of Germany's attempt forcibly to absorb Austria—which culminated in the murder by Nazis of Chancellor Dollfuss—the *Reichspost* was second to none in its advocacy of a hundred per cent Austrianism. At a later stage, however, after the arrival in Vienna of Herr von Papen, himself a Catholic, on a special mission of German-Austrian "reconciliation", Dr. Funder was converted to the policy of compromise. This became evident when there appeared in the columns of the *Reichspost* an article ascribed to a prominent member of the Austrian Hierarchy, advocating some kind of agreement with Germany and the "nationally minded" elements in Austria (i.e. the Austrian Nazis). The argument put forward was that as a result of the resistance to Germanization put up by the Church in Austria, large numbers of Austrian youth were deserting Catholicism and going over to Protestantism.

There was some truth in these contentions. For the Nazis, as I pointed out earlier in this article, did not scruple to use Protestantism as a weapon in Austria, while at the same time attacking it in the Reich. Nevertheless, the *Reichspost* article was unduly alarmist. The drift to Protestantism was a disturbing factor, but it

was by no means so extensive as the article suggested. The fears thus engendered did, however, tend to widen the division of opinion in Austrian clerical circles on the question of the attitude to be adopted towards the Nazis. But the majority, as I have said, remained opposed to embarking upon policies of undue concessions.

Dr. Funder, nevertheless, was to become one of the principal advocates of some kind of Austro-German *rapprochement*. He became very friendly with Herr von Papen, and played an important part behind the scenes, working out with the German Ambassador the scheme which eventually materialized in the Austro-German Agreement of 11 July, 1936. By this Agreement, it will be remembered, Germany recognized Austria's independence, and Austria admitted herself a German State. A number of external political considerations went to the making of this Agreement, notably the mutual desire of Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini to compromise on their Danubian differences in order to pursue a common policy in wider European affairs. Dr. Schuschnigg agreed to it because, although not unaware of the possibilities of German infiltration which it opened up, he felt that at least it would bring him a respite in his difficulties, both internal and external. As he said to me (in the course of an interview in Vienna), since Germany had agreed to recognize Austria's independence, a primary condition of the policy handed down to him by Dr. Dollfuss had been fulfilled. There was no reason, therefore, why Austro-German relations should not be normalized on this basis.

But the main idea of Dr. Funder was apparently based on the belief that, following a cessation of Austro-German differences, the situation of the Catholics in the German Reich would sensibly improve. Dr. Funder went so far along the lines of compromise that, at a later stage, the *Reichspost* joined in the German Press campaign alleging Czechoslovakia to be an outpost of Sovietism in Central Europe. Dr. Funder has a reputation in Vienna for political subtlety. But the subtlety displayed by the *Reichspost* achieved but negative results. For the situation of the Catholics in Germany deteriorated rather than

improved. Thus it was that on the occasion of the visit to Vienna last February of Baron von Neurath, the German Foreign Minister, it was precisely the *Reichspost*, by this time gravely disillusioned, that came out with a sharp criticism of Germany for having failed to improve the lot of the Catholics of the Reich following the Austro-German Agreement of last July.

I have gone into some detail regarding the role played by the *Reichspost* because the case of Dr. Funder is a good example of the attempt of certain Catholic elements in Austria to seek a solution of the Catholic problem in Germany by means of an accommodation between the Church and the Nazis. It failed, as all such attempts were bound to fail. It was but made use of by the Nazis and discarded when it had served their purpose. For the solution of the Catholic problem in Germany clearly calls not for the finessing of a Funder, but for the down-right courage of a Faulhaber. The Neurath visit, contrary to certain reports which have appeared to the contrary, resulted in a decided check to German aspirations in Austria. It is true that Germany has had the satisfaction of seeing a brake put on the wheel of Habsburg propaganda. But the explanation for this is to be found in Rome rather than in Berlin. Signor Mussolini is not unfavourable to the Habsburg restoration; but, for reasons of his general European policy, he does not at the moment wish to annoy Germany. Germany and Italy are collaborating diplomatically on a number of European questions, including Spain. It is necessary, from the Duce's point of view, to compromise with Herr Hitler on the Austrian question. Hence Italy's recent discouragement of any early attempt to restore the Habsburgs in Austria. This should not be interpreted, however, as it has been in some quarters, as Italy's consent to the German penetration of Austria in return for Germany's agreement to Italian expansion in the Mediterranean. The real facts are that Austria is being maintained in an uneasy position of balance in the centre of the Berlin-Vienna-Budapest-Rome line. But as far as Germany's hopes of further Austrian concessions to the German point of view were concerned, Baron Neurath's

visit was decidedly negative. Actually Herr von Schuschnigg's attitude appreciably stiffened, both as regards further collaboration with Germany externally and the admittance into the Austrian Cabinet of a greater number of "pronounced nationals" internally.

Herr von Schuschnigg is in the direct line of the political tradition handed down by Mgr. Seipel and Dr. Dollfuss. He is at once a good German and a patriotic Austrian. Above all, he is a devoted son of the Church. His fervent Catholicism provides the key to the true meaning of his policy. He believes that Austria has a special and historic mission, which she can only carry out if she retains her status as an independent Catholic, second German State. Herr von Schuschnigg is at heart a Monarchist, and although, for realistic motives, he is not likely to hurry forward the Habsburg question for the time being, he nevertheless maintains his attitude that it is a purely internal Austrian question, which only Austria herself can decide. The actual position in Austria at the moment is that, while German influence is necessarily stronger than before, the forces working for the preservation of Austria as an independent Catholic State are sufficiently powerful to prevent the actual absorption of Austria by Germany.

The Vatican desires the preservation of this independence. For it means (1) the keeping alive of the German Catholic tradition in Central Europe; (2) the maintenance of a rallying point for Catholicism throughout the Germanic world, and (3) the erection of a barrier against the spread of Neo-Pagan National Socialism in the Danubian Basin. Hence it may be said with truth that upon the outcome of the struggle between the National Socialist philosophy of Germany and the Catholic traditionalism of Austria will depend, to a considerable extent, the fate of civilization both in the Germanic world and in that larger world which is Europe. This is not the first time Vienna has been the scene of such a politico-religious battle. Substitute the Swastika for the Crescent, and there is at once some kind of analogy between the present struggle and the historic battle in which Starhemberg and Sobieski hurled back

the hosts of the Sultan. It is only that the present battle is both more complicated and more dangerous, because, whereas in the earlier conflict Christian German and Pole fought the Moslem Turk, today German is fighting German, and racial feeling and nationalist passions are harnessed, not to the cause of Christendom but to the cause of one of Christendom's most formidable enemies. This is the real moral of the conflict between the National Socialist racial conception of Germanism and the Austrian universalist conception of Germanism. The triumph of the former means the conquest of paganism in the Germanic world. The successful resistance of the latter means the preservation of Christendom in that world.

Something of this fight is also to be observed in the neighbouring State of Czechoslovakia. There the large German minority is divided into two main groups, the "activist" German parties (Christian-Social, Agrarian, and Social-Democrat) which collaborate with the Czechs, and the Sudetendeutsche-Heimatfront, of Herr Konrad Henlein, which is modelled on the lines of the German Nazi Party, and takes its directions from Munich and Berlin. As in Austria, the Nazi element is considerable enough, especially amongst the young people, although it does not represent the entire membership even of the Heimat Front, which is a mixture of many different elements bound together on the nationalist issue. At the last elections the "activist" parties lost a large number of adherents to Herr Henlein's party. But the recent agreement between the Czechs and the activist German parties on the question of German minority rights should, in the long run, bring back a number of the lost sheep to these parties. Actually the proportion of Christian Socials (Catholics) who went over to the Henlein organization was not so large as has been assumed in some quarters, and the Christian Social Party is now actively promoting its own youth movements.

The attempt of Nazi Germany to submit all the Germans of Central Europe, in Austria and in the Sudete in Czechoslovakia, to the process of *Gleichaltung* (uniformity)—based on the Hitlerist claim that "Germany" extends beyond the frontiers of the Reich—

The Church in Germany and Austria 243

represents a stage in the German programme which aims finally at the creation of a German-controlled *Mittel-europa* on the Danube. It is the old Pan-German expansionist dream, in a new form, and with a new technique. Like the older Pan-German schemes, it aims at a German hegemony of Europe from the Baltic to the Balkans. Politically and economically it constitutes a threat to European equilibrium. Of even greater moment is the fact, which cannot be reiterated too often, that the Pan-Germanism of Hitlerist Germany carries with it, in addition to these political and economic considerations, a menace to the European Christian tradition. Hence I would end this article on the same note as I began, with the assertion that the struggle between rival political ideologies in Europe today is in essence a religious war. The Church is being sorely tried. But out of great trials and tribulations comes renewed strength. This, I feel, is the ultimate moral of the story.

C. F. MELVILLE.

Note.—At the time of going to press there has been reported the Pope's Encyclical Letter, which was read in Catholic Churches throughout Germany on Passion Sunday. The letter refers in very strong terms to the breaking of the Concordat in regard to the confessional schools and other matters dealt with in the foregoing article. It condemns the de-Christianizing activities of the Régime, and the Nazi attempts to claim for theories of race and State a religious meaning in place of the Christian religion (i.e. the claim that Nazi ideological doctrines are religious in the sense of their being *Gottgläubig* or theistic). The Holy Father states that the struggle between the anti-Christian forces in the State and the Catholic Church has reached a critical phase. "If", he states, "through no fault of ours peace is not to come, then the Church of God will stand up for its rights and liberty."

ROME AND REACTION

THERE are not wanting signs that the Church has suffered in prestige, certainly to the extent of seeing a diminution in the number of her converts and possibly even to the extent of actually losing members, through the part which the Vatican has played in International affairs during the last two years. A recent judgement of the *Church Times* puts the matter in the following words: "The Roman Church is definitely allied with extreme reaction, and the wise judgment of the authoritative leaders of the English Church may yet save the Faith. Rome is for slavery, Canterbury for liberty." The *Church Times* at least refrains from accusing Rome of open immorality in her recent International policy, whereas many non-Catholics roundly state that in the Italo-Abyssinian war the Vatican took the side of the aggressor, thus sinning against the invariable teaching of her own theologians and moralists in regard to war and the conditions under which it may be justly waged. As for Catholics themselves, some of them find themselves obliged to take refuge in the thought that the policy of the Vatican and even of the Pope in such a practical matter does not commit the Church.

Before passing on to other instances of Vatican policy, it may be worth while making a note or two in regard to this grave matter.

In the first place there does not seem to be very much in the excuse that the Vatican does not commit the Church as such in a matter like this. In theory it does not. In her capacity as teacher of infallible doctrine and guardian of morals she is only committed when she speaks solemnly to the universal Church. Popes and papal diplomats have in the past behaved in a temporal capacity and as individual moral agents in a manner which has distressed the best Christians of the time. Today, however, when the conscience of the world has become so sore through bits of it here and there having been torn off, it is certain that the Vatican would take no step without being fully conscious of a judging world ready to be scandalized at the slightest provocation. The

strength of the Church, it knows, lies in its strongest, not in its weakest, link; and in a world which is at the moment looking for guidance in social and international morality rather than in personal morality, the Pope and the Vatican would not take up an attitude towards a burning public question like the Italo-Abyssinian war and the League except upon high motives. We may take it that in all public matters today the Church acts with the full realization of the scandal it will give if it betrays the spirit, even while safeguarding the letter, of Christian moral teaching in international and social affairs. Practically, then, the Church was committed. Nor was Pius XI the kind of man who would act from any cowardly motive, such as the fear of Mussolini, nor from any sentimental one, such as putting the interests of the country of his birth and blood before the interests of the Church.

The mainspring of the Church's action in this instance—or rather lack of action, for she refused to denounce the aggressor, as Englishmen believed Italy to be, rather than actively encouraged her—was partly a deep-seated and growing suspicion of the political and moral status of the League of Nations. On the political side, the *Osservatore Romano* recently instanced four fatal defects. They were: (1) non-recognition of the fact that war can only be suppressed if its causes are suppressed; (2) all the members of the League are in a state of non-fulfilment of the Covenant; (3) its blind inability to see the need for revision of treaties; (4) the lack of penal tribunals to judge between the nations. On the moral side the Vatican feels that the League is the happy hunting-ground of a humanistic liberalism—to put it at its best—and of an atheistic materialism—to put it at its worst. It was partly, too, the Church's fear of endangering the Lateran Treaty, on which ultimately rests the political independence of the Church. To endanger it when not absolutely necessary might mean more dependence on Fascism than ever.

After the Italo-Abyssinian war came the Spanish civil war, and the suspicions of the critics seemed to be confirmed.

In this conflict, they say, we find the Church in Spain,

supported by the Vatican and by Catholic opinion in so far as it is represented by its official or semi-official Press in all countries, favouring a military rebellion, led by a handful of Spanish generals—hitherto never taken seriously by any moralist—against a legally established government, and going so far as to inflame passions by attributing to the squabble the character of a holy war or crusade.

In regard to this criticism there is, however, a convincing answer, at any rate in so far as the Vatican is concerned. In actual fact the attitude of Pope and Vatican has been above suspicion. From the beginning, the Vatican and the Vatican Press have distinguished between the political and the religious sides of the conflict. Even now the Vatican, it seems, acknowledges the Government of Valencia. Some months ago the pro-Nationalist Spanish diplomats accredited to the Vatican drove out their pro-Madrid chief and flew the Nationalist colours over the Legation. The Vatican asked that the flag should be lowered. Only quite recently has the Vatican semi-officially recognized the Government of Burgos. The Pope's famous speech to Spanish refugees in September blessed those who were defending their religion, not their country, nor their party. And in December, when proposals for mediating between the two sides were made by France and this country, the *Osservatore Romano* welcomed them and distinguished between the political and the religious aspect of the war, only insisting that any mediation along purely political lines would leave out of account a vitally important aspect of the conflict.

Catholic public opinion in general and, without the slightest doubt, unofficial opinion at the Vatican have gone very much further than this. The view is frankly taken that Madrid stands for godless Communism or Anarchism, while the Nationalists in their struggle are, in fact, defending religion and Christian civilization. It would, however, be quite wrong to suppose that the average Catholic has any particularly high opinion of many of the Nationalists, or that he views with any relish a defence of religion by the sword. He is, however,

impressed by the steady improvement in mode of fighting on the Nationalist side and by the aims of the Requetés, or Carlists, who bear the genuine stamp of Christian chivalry, and whose programme of a Christian corporative State he hopes and believes Franco will adopt—if he can. As regards taking up the sword, he can only answer that there comes a time when the *alternative* to taking up the sword is to perish by it. Let anyone who is prepared to dispute this try to imagine his feelings if the churches and chapels, together with their pastors, of this country were treated by a supposedly legal government as have been those of Catholic Spain.

However, whatever excuses and explanations may be given, there would seem to be valid *prima-facie* grounds for the charge that Rome has been on the side of what we call "reaction" in the above two cases. The third, which is of a more general nature, appears to confirm the charge.

In recent months the Church has launched an exceptionally strong attack not only against Communism as such, but against any attempt to find some sort of compromise between Christianity and the good or true in Communism. In the view of Pius XI, Christianity and Communism are diametrically opposed because they spring from two contrary valuations of life, so that any outward sign of community of ideas, such, for example, as common opposition to *laissez-faire* capitalism or any common interest in better conditions for labour, constitutes a snare for Catholics rather than any hope of finding a common *modus vivendi*. Their paths may meet, but they do so in order to cross and diverge again more widely than ever. Pius XI has absolutely refused to allow that the economic and the social aspects of Communism can be dissociated even in theory from its philosophic and cultural aspects. He pays Communism what is, after all, a high compliment in accounting for its completeness and logical quality by supposing that, as God clearly did not inspire it, it must have been the most intelligent being after God, namely Satan: it is hardly surprising therefore that we should suspect it most when it pretends to be stupid enough to offer terms to

Christianity by separating its economic from its philosophical side. And the Pope has on his side in the matter not only the very obvious fact that Communism in its Russian home is very far from pretending to separate the two, but also the truth that never in the history of the world has any economic or social practice come into existence except as a by-product of an ethic or a religion.

It has been suggested that the Vatican's fear of Communism is such that it has actually tried to sound the way towards the formation of a political anti-Communist front. For example, it was freely rumoured at the time of Cardinal Pacelli's unexpected visit to the United States that the Secretary of State wished to find out what American democracy thought of such a step. And there is no denying that the Vatican's exasperation with Hitler is reinforced by Nazi Germany's refusal to fight Communism alongside the Vatican. But we may be certain that the Vatican has no serious intention of heading a new crusade against the new heathens of the West. On the contrary, as far as active political steps are concerned, the record of the pontificate of Pius XI is a record of ultra-caution, not one of aggression. That policy has been to *bargain* with every nation in order to obtain at the least possible cost liberty of worship, of moral practice, and of education for the Catholic members of the nation.

Three or four examples of different kinds of sacrifices for this supreme and last need in an indifferent world stand out. To ensure such liberty in France, the Church took the most unexpected step of condemning in spectacular fashion the ultra-Catholics who, in order to restore a Catholic State, came to terms in the *Action Française* movement with the ultra-Nationalists, who needed the cohesive and disciplinary force of religion. There is no need to recall the scandal caused among many Catholics themselves by this condemnation, for royalism and Catholicism had seemed to be twin brothers in France since anti-clerical tactics had been violently pursued by the republican régime. Everything intrinsically condemnable is not always condemned, and if the Vatican condemned the *Action Française* it was not merely because there was ground for condemnation, but because

it estimated that the degree of success possible for the movement was great enough permanently to damage the essential Catholic interests in democratic France, but not great enough to protect them in the long run.

In Germany, democratic Catholicism, in the form of the great Centre Party—as fine an example as the post-war world could offer of Christian politics—was dropped as surely, though not as spectacularly, as had been the Royalist Party in France, and a concordat, once again to save the essential rights of Catholics in a new and uncertain order, was made.

In Spain after the fall of the monarchy, the main influence of the Church, certainly supported by the Vatican, was again forward and not backward-looking. Spain was far more Catholic than either Germany or France, and, for that reason, there was a closer union between constructive spiritual and constructive political policy. It was hoped that a Catholic party with a social programme not unlike that of the German Centre Party and an outward form as national as the programme of the French *Action Française* would enable the Catholic tradition to be carried into the framework of the growing liberal republic. Gil Robles' *Accion Popular*, supported with some misgiving by royalists and Carlists, was republican and democratic and yet more closely linked with spiritual Catholic Action than any other Catholic political formation.

In all these instances, had the Church been thinking of regaining her ecclesiastical domination or of moulding the nation's policy in a reactionary sense, she would certainly have acted very differently. She would certainly never have condemned the *Action Française*, nor would she have dropped the German Centre Party, which, however democratic, had fought for a moral order within which alone the Church could exert any expansive pressure; while recent events have shown that her best hope in Spain lay in quite different quarters from the democratic and, *au fond*, un-Spanish *Accion Popular*.

In Italy the problem has been somewhat different. On the rooting in history of the Lateran Treaty depends the political freedom of the Church of the future. To this

end every effort has been made to take advantage of the personal and close relations of the Pope and Mussolini. Here the order of the day has undoubtedly been the kind of compromise which people with different aims but largely common interests can reach through the practical give and take of daily life. There has been trouble between the Pope and Mussolini and neither has given way on principle, but mutual forbearance has in fact resulted over a series of years in the Catholicizing up to a point and therefore in the humanizing of the Fascist practice—as compared for example with Nazism—and, in return, the political “Fascisizing” of Italian Catholics, both clerical and lay, as far as their own country is concerned. Here again the mainspring of the Church’s practical policy has not been the domination of Mussolini—no neighbour of his would think this possible—but once more the supreme need to ensure the basic liberties for individual Catholics in a régime totalitarian in theory and threatening to be so in practice. If it has turned out that in Italy the Church has come in fact to exercise a considerable influence on the moral side in internal affairs of the life of the State and society, it is the happy result of the unique conditions of the immediate juxtaposition of the material and spiritual orders. Where there is no strong antagonism towards the spiritual on the part of the material order, the result is usually, as in this case, a gradual spiritualizing of the material. Under different circumstances and within narrower limits, the same process has been at work in the development of British society. Whether the price to be paid in Italy, namely the “Fascisizing” of Italian Catholics, is any heavier than the price being paid in Britain, namely the liberalizing of English Protestants, and to some extent Catholics too, is another question. But it is important to remember that from Rome’s point of view, so long as the moral and spiritual liberties of the individual are safeguarded, and the government of the State is just and moral, the kind of régime, whether democratic or dictatorial, is immaterial. Political and civil liberties from her angle are secondary and only favoured in so far as they seem to give some guarantee for the higher liberties.

It is not hard to envisage States in which the very defence of exaggerated or immorally grounded civil and political liberties constitutes a threat to spiritual liberties, and others where their strict control or even suppression favours those same spiritual liberties. There is no *a-priori* rule.

It would therefore seem clear that, apart from the very strong but, even so, negative condemnation of Communism, the Church has confined her political activity to the defence, according to the different circumstances ruling in different countries, of the essential moral and spiritual liberties of her subjects. The positive condemnation of Communism has, as it were, overshadowed without actually affecting this policy. It has meant a bias in favour of countries and policies that are openly anti-Bolshevik. In Italy, an accidental bias in favour of Fascism has reinforced the first bias, and between them led to what looked uncommonly like taking sides—not necessarily a thing to be deplored—in the recent dispute between that country and the League. In countries like Austria and Portugal, the Church has favoured an authoritarian régime as a guarantee against Socialism and totalitarianism. In Spain, the Church has been witnessing the logical effects of the long downward path—as it thinks—from a Christian régime, through scepticism, humanistic liberalism, agnosticism, materialistic liberalism, discontent, disorder, and virtual anarchy, to the final clash between atheistic tyranny of Communism and what is left of Christianity protected by some sort of well-disposed dictatorship. Yet even in the face of this striking example of the evils of Communism and of what leads to it, the policy of the Vatican itself has been the same as its old policy in republican Spain, in France, Germany, Mexico, and elsewhere, namely, to seek for the most likely means of preserving in the long run as many of the essential liberties of the individual Catholics as it can. In Germany and to some extent even in Austria, the Church's bias in favour of an openly anti-Communist policy has by no means been strong enough to outweigh her determination to fight for her children. On the contrary, at the time of writing, we seem to be on the eve of a more or less open

fight between National Socialism and the Church, a fight imposed upon the Church by the failure of the Concordat to attain the ends for which the Church signed it.

The fact that the Vatican evidently detests Communism and the liberalism which she fears leads up to it, and yet scarcely makes more than negative efforts to preserve Europe from this plague, has led observers to conclude that Pius XI, so far from being a reactionary anxious to dominate Europe, rather despairs of Europe. Despite his conviction about the evil forces at work, he is content with fighting, for as long as possible, rear-guard actions to preserve his subjects from the ultimate consequence to them of the dominant philosophies of the day, all of which are characterized by an agnostic liberalism—working itself out into anarchy and from anarchy into a despotism either wholly evil, as in Russia, or mainly evil, as in Germany, or, by reaction, comparatively good, as in Italy and Portugal. So much so that it is said—and one has heard it from sources in close touch with Rome—that Pius XI can only look to the future of the Church in the mission fields, which are in fact being made as autonomous and independent of Europe as possible. He can see little hope for Europe itself, at any rate on other than supernatural grounds.

But when all is said and done, it is well to remember that the Catholic Church is primarily a religion and only secondarily a philosophy of life and only thirdly a social-reform institution. Those who would have her concentrate either on a quasi-political attack on Communism and agnostic liberalism or on bringing about a new reign of economic and social justice forget that she is powerless to effect anything except in so far as these secondary and tertiary matters automatically result from conviction in her religious dogma and practice of her moral teaching. To concentrate on them at a time when her essential function is widely challenged may be good short-term policy, but it is neither honest nor likely to pay in the long run. One may be sure that the Vatican realizes that, if the Church has much to say about social reform and international morality and a great part to play in the fight against Communism and agnostic liberalism, her

immediate and primary task must be to defend and to win back ground on her dogmatic and moral side, for it is from this side alone that the rest of the things she would like to do can find their spring and their coercive force.

If this essential need be taken into account and the amount of work being done throughout the world for this purpose be noted, one will scarcely be surprised at the fact that every critic of the Church, whether himself a Catholic or not, can find matters for dissatisfaction in her more public and more spectacular behaviour. The best kind of liberal mind, not excluding the mind of many Catholics, will feel very keenly the apparent lack of leadership given by Rome in social and international questions, the rights and wrongs of which are preoccupying the minds of our generation. The Tory clubman, who has his counterpart in every country, will ask why the Church cannot put herself at the head of a veritable crusade against Communism and Atheism and Socialism. The Socialist will say that the Church is too stupid and cowardly to infuse the required degree of right religious belief into extremist movements, undertaken for the highest reasons but failing through the crudity of the religious feelings that inspire them.

The fact is, however, that the Church has neither been reactionary nor progressive—the two are in fact a matter of either going forward or backward along the same line of secular, non-Christian, though possibly vaguely religious, thinking. She can be called either static or revolutionary, according as one thinks of her in herself or in relation to her environment. She does not change, but everything around her is constantly changing, and her policy, *au fond*, consists of attempts to lessen the friction that is ever being produced by the contact between the static Church and the revolving environment. Her action, her life, as opposed to her policy, is the worship of God and the work for the salvation of souls in accordance with the Revelation vouchsafed and entrusted to her. That never changes.

MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE.

TRADITION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

IN most people's minds the idea of *traditionalism* and the idea of *social justice* are opposed to one another by their very nature. In Europe, at least in the past, the parties and sections of political thought which have upheld the idea of tradition, of conserving the fruits of the past—and hence came to be called conservatives—have opposed innovations in the political system which have had as their object the economic betterment of the masses. Though in theory they may have agreed that changes ought to come, slowly, with new circumstances, in practice they have planted their feet firmly in the past and refused to move until they have been moved by force. On the other hand those parties or groups which—however they may intend putting it into practice—have got their main inspiration from the idea of social justice have usually believed that traditionalism is their deadliest enemy and that improvements can never come until we are dis-embarrassed from “the dead-weight of the past”. They revolt against history and, if it is suggested that we should base the future on past precedents or at least consult the past before embarking on the future, they believe that such suggestions are only an effort to prevent anything being done. There are urgent, immediate things to be done, they say, matters of life and death. And they are so far right. These two outlooks or frames of mind—or even temperaments—seem unable to meet one another on any common ground or to share any common terminology. Yet the future depends on whether these two history-long opponents, the conservative and the reformer, can be brought to terms.

Conservatism or traditionalism has a bad name in Europe. It began to lose its grip with the French Revolution, but it did not abate its claims. Louis XVIII, when he returned to Paris after the Napoleonic storm, was said to have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing since his exile. With Metternich and the Holy Alliance, conservatism maintained itself in unabated power for several decades, and the essential work of the statesman, as Metternich conceived it, was to erase from the minds of

men every hope that the French Revolution had raised. Metternich had no thought of harnessing the forces of history and baptizing them; it was a question of going back on history and defeating it. This aim proved impossible. The whole of the nineteenth century was the scene of the slow defeat of conservative and traditionalist forces; time after time they had to give way. The principal political movements of the nineteenth century were victories for liberalism—from the Reform Bill in England to the emancipation of the serfs in Russia. The *Risorgimento* in Italy was carried through under the auspices of liberal ideas and seemed as much a defeat for Austria as for the Papacy. Pius IX stirred, and sent out a warning against the evils of deracinate democracy, but he seemed to the intelligensia of the age only to be battering his head against a wall. A pseudo-traditionalism managed to revive in France under Napoleon III, but it was only the tradition of the Bonapartes, not of the Bourbons, and it only lasted nineteen years. England remained the first of the world powers throughout the greater part of the nineteenth century, and in England even conservatism was liberal, and a conservative Prime Minister, Disraeli, gave the final consecration to democracy.

Only in Germany, Austro-Hungary, and Russia was conservatism still powerful. All three régimes had held out against the shop-keeping or middle class, the *bourgeois* class, and retained a government of entirely traditional form, a ruling military class, a powerful aristocracy and an Emperor. And so the Great War, with which the nineteenth century burst and ended, was apparently a final victory for the "liberal and progressive" powers over the "forces of reaction" in Europe. It was claimed to be a war to make the world safe for democracy, a "democratic" war, and it ended with an overwhelming victory for the "democratic" powers—above all for France, England, and the United States.

Today we are seeing the "democratic" or "liberal" powers uniting themselves with ever-increasing readiness with the revolutionary forces in Europe and even with extremist forces such as Bolshevism. In the case of the Spanish civil war, English and French liberals express all

their sympathy with the socialist and anarchist extremists who, at first sight, profess doctrines which are the very reverse of liberal. We ought therefore to suspect that, however different they may seem, liberalism and Bolshevism have some common love or hate. What is it that unites the *Manchester Guardian* with the Kremlin, or at least makes the *Manchester Guardian* view the Kremlin with scarcely disguised sympathy? There is something positive that they have in common; both view politics primarily as a means for obtaining social and economic justice. But what they have in common negatively is even more important; they share their hatred for traditionalist movements in Europe and even for tradition itself.

Traditionalists have of course given ground for this hatred. They represent something essential in society, the preservation of the culture; but in modern times this preservation of the national culture and heritage has only been carried on through the preservation of the privilege of a small class of society against the interests of the majority. In France, for instance, conservatism and Catholicism—the second by its very nature is a conservative force in spite of its religious dynamism—have become allied with an economic policy in favour of the rich and the aristocracy. The need for a social reorganization has become more and more crying with the years; and hence conservatism has lost touch with the masses, who have been allowed to fall into the opposite camp. It is the doctrine only of the rich, of those who are out of touch with the problems of the age, and of a number of brilliant intellectuals. In England conservatism is not really traditional—it only believes in nineteenth-century tradition in the field of economics and wants the preservation of an anti-traditional system. It could even thinkably adopt a whole element of the ideology of socialism under another name.

Tradition has become so allied with the interests of the rich and privileged that each victory of liberalism in the nineteenth century was at the same time a defeat of the traditionalist spirit and a victory which seemed to liberate the masses from some form of economic or political slavery.

The anti-traditionalists thought that a new epoch was beginning in 1918, that at last we had visible historical signs that mankind could be liberated from the incubus of the past, and the old bogies of war and superstition had departed for ever. In a sense Geneva was the consecration of this new hope. The new age was to be an age of education and enlightenment, of technical progress, of much greater ease for the masses. A United States of Europe on liberal lines was not unthinkable, save that one asked oneself *Why Europe?* Was there not a world civilization greater than Western civilization, and was not the very idea of Europe a concession to that fatal traditionalism of the past?

It was here that the devotees of liberalism made their vast mistake, and this mistake is tracking them down today. Both British and French labour movements seem to hate tradition and European culture. No more than Marx are they able to understand how strong it is; hence their hope that those movements which have been clever enough to tap the deep sources of their national tradition, such as Italian Fascism and German Nazism, will come to a speedy end. In other words tradition is as essential to social and civilized life as social justice is. Without tradition there is no deep respect for the very bases of civilized life, for religion and culture, for property, for the simple virtues of courage, honesty, perseverance, family life, and patriotism. The Left movements of Europe are by the very force of their impetus coming to think of even these simple virtues as errors which have fettered mankind in the past and now need overhauling. Left intellectuals hope for a new sort of world in which religion, patriotism, and family life will only be historical curiosities. There will only be mankind, Humanity, and the pooling of all resources for an ideal order and progress.

Now the conception of Humanity—in the sense that it is used by the spokesman of the Left, or at Geneva—is entirely deracinate. It is impossible to love all mankind unless you first love individual men, and unless your love goes out in circles, always widening, from the family to the locality, from the locality to the State, from the State to the culture—in the sense that we all live in our

European culture—and then maybe to mankind as a whole. The modern State has broken down local culture, whether the French State of the Revolution or the English commercial State; but this is an evil. The Left conception of Humanity only accentuates the evil to an immense degree, being born of the deracinateness of life—especially working- and middle-class life in the modern State. “Universality is the negation of cosmopolitanism”, wrote Miguel de Unamuno; “the more a man belongs to his time and his country the more he will belong to all times and all countries.”* The Left movements are strong amongst those classes which do not share the heritage of European culture.

Culture in this sense of the word (in the German sense of the word *Kultur*) is bound up with tradition and cannot be separated from it.† Most unfortunately, culture itself has become an artificial product in English-speaking countries and is taken to mean the intellectual development of certain restricted classes. It is cosmopolitan rather than universal. Hence it is very difficult to explain to English people exactly what the word culture originally meant and how it is still a basic force in our civilization. The concept of a *popular* culture, which is the only real form of culture, is lacking because the reality does not seem to exist. There is still something of a popular culture in the west of Ireland, but it is such a primitive one that, if used as an instance, it is almost certain to give the wrong impression. The half-barbarian who goes to his office every morning in the London tube is sure to feel that there is no common denominator between life in Kingston-on-Thames and life in the Gaeltacht—the latter being a thousand years behind in technical development.

If we mention other districts of Europe where popular cultural life is still most pronounced we are liable to give the same impression of remoteness. The Austrian Tyrol, many of the smaller Italian cities, Navarre and Old Castile, Brittany and Bavaria are examples of

* *Commentary on the Life of Don Quixote*, Chap. XII.

† On this, as on many other points, there is the admirable commentary of Christopher Dawson's essays, and his recent book, *Religion and the Modern State*.

popular cultures. But all these cultures are technically primitive and their primitiveness might well seem to explain why they continue. They are not in touch with the modern world, and in so far as they come into touch with it, and especially with industrialism, they decay.

The supposition that these traditional cultures of Europe cannot survive industrialism (the Marxist supposition as well as the average capitalist view) seems to me quite false. In fact, the "either . . . or" of modern Europe depends on whether or not European culture, which is still immensely strong, will be able to absorb machinery and control it and, so to speak, baptize it. That this, to a certain extent, is possible is shown in parts of Switzerland, where the introduction of machinery and an unusually high standard of technical development has not torn up the life of the people by the roots but managed to reach a certain harmony with the landscape of Swiss tradition. What I mean can be shown by comparing a town like St. Gallen in Switzerland with a town like Wigan in England. In one town traditional life has been preserved as well as beauty, whereas the other has destroyed every vestige of culture and created a foul mass of blackened buildings with a deracinate unhappy proletariat and an ignorant and irresponsible middle class.

In 1918 it would have been easy to believe that there would be no traditional revival; but if the epoch which culminated at Versailles marked victory after victory to the anti-traditional forces in Europe, the period that followed has been almost uninterruptedly a period of victory for traditionalism over nineteenth-century liberalism—so much so that there is reason to think that the twentieth century spreading before us may be as distinguished by a traditional revival as the nineteenth was for the victory of liberalism. All over the Continent we see a will emerging to hark back to the traditions of the people and to the traditional culture—not precisely under the form in which it has survived without contact with the modern world, but in a new form. This emerging form encourages technical development with every energy, while at the same time maintaining its intention of preserving the basic cultural life of the people by

subordinating technical and commercial development to traditional ideals.

This new will to preserve the traditional and cultural inheritance of the peoples lies behind all those movements which are popularly called "Fascist", and these movements have developed so much in recent years that they have already become a world force of the first class. There are deep differences in these various systems, owing to national circumstances, but the growing ideological split in Europe has brought them together. Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Portugal, and (perhaps) Spain are now as powerful on the Continent as the liberal and socialist powers which comprise the League of Nations. It is impossible, save for controversial purposes, to accuse these countries of "putting the clock back", because in spite of their emphasis on tradition they are in the forefront of technical development, and compared with the speed of their technical advance, given the means at their disposal, it is liberal countries like France and England which seem backward.

It is perfectly true that Fascism is in line with the post-Revolutionary developments of the State, so far as its totalitarian tendencies are declared, and quite separate from the cultural and localized system of the eighteenth-century monarchies, but on the other hand Fascism represents a return to historical realism, a reaction against the deracinate cosmopolitanism which preceded it. Its coming into the modern world is the most striking of all signs of the new Middle Ages which, as Berdyaev has suggested, lie before us. The strictness of its discipline is suggestive of feudalism, and this discipline may be a necessary means for giving mankind today a corporative social conscience—an inevitable reaction against political individualism and economic *laissez-faire* in the nineteenth century. The very exaggerations of the claims of the Fascist State over the individual and its use of military discipline for knitting the atoms of society into a corporative whole suggest a comparison with the achievements of feudalism in building up our civilization. The feudal age was in one sense perhaps the least pleasant of ages, but it was a necessary school through which Europe had to pass: without the anti-humanist epoch,

the humanism of the late twelfth century onwards would have been almost unthinkable. The concepts of *order* and *corporativism* which lay behind feudalism were as necessary to our civilization as the concept of personal liberty and justice between men.

The comparison between feudalism and the new order and traditionalism which he calls "Fascism" would probably be accepted readily by the cosmopolitan socialist or liberal propagandist, with the added suggestion that "Fascism" was "putting the clock back to the feudal age" and that both these movements were similar in their denial of social justice. This sort of discussion is immensely complicated by the anti-historicism of Marxist writers who really beg the very question they ought to prove by their use of catcalls which tend to identify such different processes as "feudalism" and "capitalism", or "socialism", "liberty", and "democracy". Traditionalism by its very nature, if it remains healthy, is bound to oppose capitalism in the sense we understand it today. The accumulation of nearly all the means of production in a few hands and the irresponsible condition of mind which it begets both in employers and employed is nearly as much opposed to the basic needs of our tradition and culture as Bolshevism is. From the traditionalist point of view there are very striking similarities between Manchester and Moscow and not a great deal to choose between them. Traditionalism is bound to view *bourgeois* materialism, whether in Manchester or Moscow, as a relapse in the spiritual energy of the life of mankind, as a defeat for European history. Hence it is something fundamentally separate from conservative capitalism—the thing with which the cosmopolitan socialist nearly always identifies it.

The economic materialism which is bound up with historical capitalism has its roots in the liberal doctrine of *laissez-faire*; and, by a paradox, democracy, which the socialists view as the cure for capitalism, was actually bound up historically with its begetting. British democratic individualism is the father of modern capitalism. It is no coincidence that those countries where democracy and *laissez-faire* seem most firmly established—England, France, the United States, Holland—are the countries

which are the most unshakably capitalist in their economic organization. Democracy is a necessary screen for liberal capitalism. A working-class vote is a necessary guarantee for a smoothly working capitalist system, a harmless palliative for the workers. Capitalism can never be broken by purely democratic methods; it is only weakened in so far as there is some departure from democratic procedure, at least in spirit, as the Roosevelt experiment in the United States has shown.

Hence as soon as we are liberated from the conviction that democracy and social justice are identifiable, we will lose our main ground for supposing that the new traditionalist and authoritarian régimes are bound to be enemies of social justice, even though they do not make social justice the first article in their programme. The first objection to authoritarian systems is the *a-priori* one—the Marxist or liberal assumption that they *must* be anti-working-class. An objective and impartial examination of them from this point of view, which is still scarcely possible in “liberal” countries, would yield some results which are surprising in themselves and flatly disprove the central theses of Marxism.

The claim of the new authoritarian systems is that they are anti-capitalist and anti-Marxist at the same time. As in the case of Italian Fascism, they reject the idea of complete economic equality as an impossibility, at least today, but they maintain that the desire for complete economic equality is not what mankind really wants. Mussolini said that “there is no greater buffoonery” in socialism than the contention that human happiness depends mainly on material prosperity. Here we have an assertion, Mussolini against Marx, and history will judge which is right. The essential need today, according to “Fascism”, is not so much that of economic equality as that of corporative security, a sense of confidence in one another on the part of the different classes, which can only be achieved if the working classes can appeal to the State against the wealthy classes, and if the State guarantees that their pride in their work, their throwing of their heart into it, will not be exploited by the wealthy classes for private ends.

The new authoritarian movements have made a clean

departure from nineteenth-century traditionalism in this respect. Their dogma that only those who work shall be fed has been the basis for breaking the power of the large absentee landlords and the wealthy *rentier* classes; and it has given to Italian and German life their rather puritan aspect, that lack of luxurious living (at least in public) which makes Rome and Berlin seem almost sombre compared with the riotous life of the South of France or of Paris and the West End of London. In Rome and even in Berlin there are hardly any cabarets and very little champagne, and it is exceedingly difficult to obtain many of those luxuries which the rich indulge in before the public gaze in "liberal" countries.

But the object of this article is not to show that various régimes in existence—which differ immensely from one another in any case—have achieved a good working system of social justice. It is to show that the political hope of mankind rests in the assimilation into the long tradition of our civilization of those new movements and real needs which have sprung up as a result of modern conditions, and especially of the machine age. The more tradition is crushed, the more it will re-emerge in twisted forms. That is part of the problem of National Socialism.

During the nineteenth century the influence of mechanization was almost entirely disruptive of tradition, and it is still so in the East. It has called up far higher demands on the part of the masses by widening their economic horizon. These demands are largely just and right, as the masses could not help being cramped in the economic cadre which the nineteenth century offered them, owing to the disproportion between the dreams and ambitions opened up to them by mechanization and the sordid reality of the world in which they lived. The great age of unrestrained capitalism depended on these ambitions, on this urge for economic self-betterment amongst the masses, and yet, because it could not fulfil them, it drove the masses to putting their trust in revolutionary ideas. Marx was right when he maintained that unrestrained capitalist industrialism begets its own destruction.

It is with the other half of the story that I have been most concerned—the half that Marx entirely failed to

understand. Deracinate industrial capitalism begot an even more deracinate industrial socialism, the anti-historical, anti-cultural, anti-traditional ideas of the International, of the Wellsian man in the street, of the "progressive" without roots, of the League of Nations, of the middlebrow boor.

These currents of thought—and they all come into harmony on certain basic sympathies—might have won through, had European tradition and culture been as weak as they maintained them to be. But year after year European culture and tradition have again been raising their head. Often this has happened in crude and primitive and even twisted forms, as we might expect from a reaction against odds, but it has happened. The last instance—a classic one—was the revolt of Franco's armies against the deracinate International government which attacked Spanish culture at the roots. Franco was followed, not by a wavering mass of the rich, as the socialists prophesied—confident that tradition was fighting a losing battle—but by a mass of the people with every sign of youth, virility, and victory. We may conceive of the same thing happening again and again elsewhere. It is necessary that we return to history and the traditional and simple conception of man. Man the progressive, the eugenicist, the commercialist, the liberal-socialist, the internationalist, is faced by man the *pius* (in the Virgilian sense), man the father, man the unsophisticated—even man the warrior. The everlasting man would die, it was predicted, but he has not done so.

These signs of the re-emergence of the spirit of history as yet only give a suggestion of the form that the new age may take. How far they may manage successfully to combine our two needs—tradition and social justice—and end the unnatural divorce of the past still remains to be seen. But each of these elements of a lasting civilization ought to be complementary to the other. Without tradition social justice can never rid itself of the poisons of individualism, or of a deracinate collectivism; without social justice tradition cannot remain permanent, something rooted in all the elements of a community and knitting them together with a spiritual bond.

BERNARD WALL.

AN INTERNUNCIO IN ENGLAND, 1830-31

THAT the arrival in England of a Papal diplomat should be one of the consequences of a revolution seems indeed strange. Such, however, was the case in 1830, when the revolution that broke out in Belgium towards the end of August subsequently led to the Internuncio at the Hague being obliged to leave his post, as his life was in danger. His name was Monsignore Francesco Capaccini. He had been advised that London was the most suitable place to which he could withdraw for a month or two until more tranquil conditions returned.

Capaccini had in London a friend whose acquaintance he had made when the latter was Rector of the English College, namely Bishop Gradwell. On 12 October Capaccini sent him the following letter from Antwerp.*

My Lord,

12 October, 1830.

The political events of this country will probably procure me, within a few days, the pleasure of seeing you again. I believe that I shall be obliged to retire to London, for two or three months, in order to ask for and receive instructions from my Court. For reasons of prudence and economy I wish to live (absolutely incognito) in London, and quite modestly. Counting on our long-standing friendship, I request you to do something to find me a furnished room in the house of some respectable person. I shall only have my servant with me, and room enough for his bed will suffice for him.

I shall probably come to London on the steamboat from Ostend. In case I have time to wait here for a reply, please send me your address so that I can look you up on arrival in London. But, if by any chance I have to leave here in the next two or three days, please leave me your address at the bureau of the inn where the steamboat usually disembarks its passengers, as I shall stay at that inn and shall ask there for your address.

With the greatest esteem and looking forward to embracing you once again,

I remain,

Your most devoted servant and friend,

F. CAPACCINI,

Internuncio Apostolico.

Antwerp, 12 October, 1830.

C/o M. le Grand Vicaire Sterch.

* Westminster Diocesan Archives. The original, like all Capaccini's correspondence here quoted, is in Italian.

Capaccini does not inform us of the date of his departure from Antwerp, but he had already on 18 October taken his decision to leave. Travelling by way of Ghent and Bruges he arrived at Ostend, where he embarked for London, probably about 20 October. Five days later he gave, as his address, Chapel House, Cadogan Street, Chelsea, where he occupied an apartment in which Cardinal Weld had once resided when he was a priest at Chelsea.

Two days earlier the Internuncio had visited the Foreign Office, where Mr. Falch, the Dutch Ambassador, introduced him to Lord Aberdeen, the Foreign Secretary, who had already been informed of Capaccini's arrival in London by the British Ambassador at the Hague. After the introduction, Capaccini withdrew to the ante-chamber while Mr. Falch had a conversation with Lord Aberdeen. A few moments afterwards the French Ambassador, Prince de Talleyrand, entered the ante-chamber. Capaccini immediately recognized Talleyrand from portraits he had seen of him, whereas his own costume told Talleyrand that he was an ecclesiastic, but the fact that he was calling at the Foreign Office also suggested that he was a diplomat. Talleyrand was puzzled and stood scanning him from head to foot with the greatest curiosity. Capaccini bowed low and continued to read the paper on the table.

Mgr. Capaccini did not spend long at Chelsea, for on 13 November he wrote informing Cardinal Albani of a change of address.* The Prince of Orange, who had also come to London, wished to see him daily, and as the distance to the Prince's residence from Chelsea was about four miles Mgr. Gradwell found him an apartment near the Prince's. He was now at No. 34 Golden Square, next door to Bishop Gradwell, living in the same square as his old superior and benefactor, Cardinal Consalvi, had done in 1814.

In the meantime a month had already passed since Capaccini came to London, but he still thought that the moment had not yet come for him to return to the

* Capaccini to Albani, 13 November, 1831, *Archivio Vaticano, Segretario di Stato* 256.

Hague. Having talked the matter over with the Spanish Minister, de Zea Bermudez, who was a talented diplomat as well as a deeply religious man, it was decided that the interests of the Holy See would be best served if Capaccini went over to the Hague and left his secretary, Canon Antonucci, as *Chargé d'Affaires*. He himself would return and live as privately and modestly as possible. He would not be obliged to keep a carriage and horses, and as these would cost 2000 scudi (£112) a year, he would thus reduce his expenses, though the enormous distances would no doubt oblige him to take a cab now and then.

By the end of the month Capaccini received his first instructions from Rome.* The Pope entirely approved of the line he had taken; if it was true that a congress of the Great Powers was to be held in London, not only for the consideration of the Belgian question, but of European affairs in general, the Pope hoped Capaccini would be able to render useful service in furthering the cause of general peace. The conference met for the first time at the Foreign Office on 4 November, but limited itself to the Belgian question.

Cardinal Albani instructed Capaccini to use what influence he could to obtain the recognition of the right of a small State to summon a larger State to its assistance in restoring order in its internal affairs. The Secretary of State was pro-Austrian in his sympathies and foresaw that the Papal States would be in need of assistance if the influence of the Paris revolution made itself felt in Italy. There was also some business to transact with the British Government concerning property in Sicily which belonged to the Archdiocese of Malta, and which the King of the Two Sicilies, who formerly held the right of nomination to the see, wished to retain in order to endow a new see at Caltanissetta. The British Government maintained that the King had lost all right of nomination when Malta was ceded to England, and objected to any alienation of the property belonging to the Archdiocese of Malta.

Finally, Capaccini was to see "Mr. Gravel" (Greville),

* Albani to Capaccini, 13 November, 1830, *ibid*.

Clerk of the Privy Council, to present the Cardinal's compliments and "remind him of the resolution he had taken, as he told me last year in Rome, to bring about the abrogation of the laws forbidding the English Government to maintain relations or to correspond with the Holy See". Greville had spent several weeks in Rome in the spring of that very year—1830—not "last year", as Albani wrote. He had had an audience of the Pope. What exactly passed between him and the Secretary of State has not transpired, but an entry in Greville's diary under the date of 30 June, 1835, shows what he thought of the law forbidding intercourse with Rome.*

Cardinal Albani no doubt had a false conception of the powers of the Clerk of the Privy Council. Capaccini informed him that the matter depended entirely on the House of Commons. "Time and the force of circumstances will accomplish much more than men, and such a monstrous absurdity must necessarily come to an end some day."†

Besides these commissions for the Secretary of State, Capaccini was informed that he would shortly receive instructions from the Prefect of Propaganda, Cardinal Capellari. Mgr. Gradwell was actually trying to obtain the favourable influence of the Government for certain missions in British India, and Capaccini might be of assistance to him. So although no special business of the Holy See had brought Capaccini to London, it was not long before he found the means of carrying out his desire "to do something for the service of the Holy See in London". Moreover, he was shortly ordered "not to leave London without necessity until further instructions", as his presence there was valuable.‡

In the meantime, Pope Pius VIII had died on 1 December. Capaccini learnt the news from the papers of 10 December. Four days later he received the official announcement from Rome. Next day Capaccini delivered to the Hanoverian Minister, Count Munster,

* Cf. *Greville Diary*, edit. Wilson, Vol. I, p. 439.

† Capaccini to Albani, 30 November, 1830, *ibid.*

‡ Pollidori to Capaccini, 16 December, 1830, *ibid.*

a packet that had arrived by the same courier—presumably the announcement of the Pope's death. The Count presented it to the King, who promised to send his reply to the Sacred College within a few days. (In 1823, on receipt of a Papal letter announcing the death of Leo XII, Canning had consulted the Law Officers as to whether a reply might be sent. They informed him that by the Statute 5 Eliz., cap. 1, s. 2 an answer addressed to the Supreme Pontiff might, in their opinion, subject the writer to the penalties of *Praemunire*. Canning surmounted the difficulty by sending an informal reply. On the death, therefore, of Pius VIII the Sacred College communicated the news to William IV as King of Hanover, who, as such, maintained diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Gregory XVI wrote to the King of Hanover to announce his elevation to the Supreme Pontificate. The new Pope told Sir Brook Taylor that "he had received a gracious letter from His Majesty a few days since, as King of Hanover, and was aware that he had none to expect from His Majesty as King of Great Britain".*)

The instructions telling Capaccini not to leave London were written on 16 December. He had, however, already made up his mind to cross over to Holland, leave his secretary at the Hague as *Chargé d'Affaires*, and then return to London, as he had informed the Secretary of State in his letter of 26 November. On 21 December he wrote to Mgr. Pollidori, Secretary of the Conclave, announcing his departure for the 26th, as he had not received any reply to his letter of 26 November. In 1830 it took seventeen days for a letter from Rome to reach London by ordinary courier, so that Capaccini had already taken a boat at Harwich before the instructions of 16 December had arrived in London. On 12 January Capaccini left the Hague again for London. The steamboat service from Ostend had been suspended, presumably on account of the troubles in Belgium, and the Internuncio had to leave by sailing boat, arriving at Harwich on the 14th, after a painful crossing that lasted forty-eight hours. When he first

* Brook Taylor to Palmerston, Public Record Office, F.O., 43/24.

arrived in England the previous October, the Internuncio had thought it more prudent to enter the country as a private individual, not knowing what kind of impression the arrival of a Minister of the Holy See might make in London. He decided, however, that he would suffer no inconvenience from declaring himself to be what he was, and both on the journey from London to the Hague and vice versa he travelled as Internuncio and "was pleased to say that he had received from the English Government all the honours that anyone of his position in the service of another Sovereign would have received".*

The next four days he spent making visits in London and had a very long and most interesting conversation with Lord Palmerston. In fact, Capaccini had hardly returned to London when the Prince of Orange sent his secretary to congratulate him on his safe return; he was also informed that Lord Palmerston wished to speak to him, but before doing so the Prince would like to see him. The Prince told the Internuncio that the Foreign Secretary wished to consult him in order to have an exact idea of the state of Belgium and of what was happening there, to know if it was true that the Prince of Orange, who entertained hopes of the Belgian Crown, had a strong following in Belgium. The long and interesting conversation with Lord Palmerston took place on 18 January. Among other things Palmerston wished to know whether Catholic interests would be sufficiently guaranteed if the Prince of Orange became King of Belgium.

Cardinal Capellari, Prefect of Propaganda, who had already formed a close friendship with Capaccini while the latter was assisting him in negotiating the concordat between the Holy See and the Low Countries, after a conclave lasting close on two months was elected Pope on 7 February, 1831, and took the name of Gregory XVI. The new Pope appointed another of Capaccini's friends, Cardinal Bernetti, to be pro-Secretary of State. As a result, the Vatican Archives contain not only the Internuncio's official dispatches, but also several private letters

* Capaccini to Pollidori, 20 January, 1831, *ibid.*

which constitute a valuable source of information on Capaccini's doings in England during the year 1831. He did not wish, he wrote, to congratulate the Cardinal on his appointment, but wished him light from heaven and supernatural strength, such as were necessary at the moment—when revolution had broken out in the Papal States. "The best thing the Pope could have done", wrote Capaccini to Bernetti, "was to appoint you Secretary of State. If we can work together, I hope that in spite of the times we shall accomplish something. I wrote my ideas to Pollidori (Secretary of the Conclave). . . . With Thomas I will willingly cook, even with the title of scullion. If God had given me *carte blanche* to name a Pope or a Secretary of State I would have done what has been done, only I would I had done it quicker. Ah, poor Albani will have to spend a few years in purgatory, if indeed he ever passes thence to eternal glory. I don't ask you to say anything particular to the former Capellari (Gregory XVI) as words fail me. Say what you feel yourself and I am sure you will say what I would have said."*

On his return from Holland, Capaccini had again changed his residence. He was now staying with a Mr. Cobb at 46 Cirencester Place, Fitzroy Square. "Cobb is an excellent Catholic with whom I am lodging. He doesn't know a word of French or Italian, so you can always write to me without an envelope to save me spending four shillings and sixpence for a letter in an envelope. Without an envelope it only costs half that price." (A letter sent without an envelope was folded and sealed, the address being written on the outside.)

An interesting feature of Capaccini's letters at this period is the code he used to ensure secrecy, should his letters be opened in the post, as they so often were by inquisitive Government agents at that time. The Pope was given the name of Mercury, Capellari that of Micole, and Capaccini became Agostino; Rome, Warsaw; and the Holy See, Sister; while the Internuncio signed

* Capaccini to Bernetti, 1 March, 1831, *Archivio Vaticano, Segretario di Stato* 165.

himself "Ceno da Varlungo". This reminds us of the eighteenth-century practice of referring to the Pope as Mr. Hilton and to Rome as Babylon. In accordance with the same plan, the letters he sent to Bernetti were addressed to "Madame Lebrun".

"Remember to send Madame Lebrun to the post," he wrote, "as I shall probably write to her." Three days later he again wrote to the Secretary of State and addressed the letter to Madame Lebrun, *née* Carron. For a month he continued writing to his *amica carissima*, Madame Lebrun, and to his *carissima sorella*, Signora Anastasia Coletti. On 15 April, replying to a letter of 22 March, Bernetti wrote :

"I have received no letter for Madame Lebrun, nor for Anastasia Coletti, nor for any other of those, as arranged. Such names are frequent in Rome, and if at the post-office the letters are not immediately set aside to be sent up to the Secretariate of State, they risk falling into other hands. If you wish to write me private and confidential letters I would rather you addressed them to people living with me."

To Lord Palmerston, Capaccini also wrote in Italian. "Since your Excellency writes Italian so well, I take the liberty of replying in my native tongue, and I do so all the more readily since this manner of corresponding with your Excellency would, in case of an accident, be evident proof that our correspondence had no official or diplomatic character."* Thus there was no fear of punishment for breaking the law forbidding correspondence with the Holy See.

In April 1831 the Austrian and French Ambassadors at Rome, together with the Prussian and Russian Ministers, met in a diplomatic conference to which an agent of the British Government, Sir Brook Taylor, was sent to assist, though not in an official capacity. The conference was called in the hopes of settling the differences that had arisen between the Pope and his temporal subjects. At such a moment, Capaccini's presence in London might be useful to the Holy See. In addition, he had been commissioned to see if it was

* Capaccini to Palmerston, Copy, 20 March, 1831, *ibid*.

possible to raise a loan of one or two million scudi in London for the Papal Government, and to procure Irish volunteers for the Papal Army. "After all that," wrote Bernetti, on 19 April, "you will understand that it would be quite impossible to obtain permission from the Holy Father for you to return to Rome, even temporarily, until the negotiations here in progress have been concluded. Finally, I shall not need you to urge me anew to comply with your wishes, as I desire to have you near me here, perhaps even more than you do not wish not to be over there, and in this the Holy Father entirely shares my sentiments." The Pope was pleased with Capaccini's work in London and expressed his satisfaction at seeing the Internuncio's relations with the Government becoming closer.

But the April showers of 1831 were probably rather heavy, and Capaccini began to feel depressed and unwell. He had been very actively engaged on diplomatic business for the last two months and was "worn out from having continuously led the life of a post-horse". On the 29th of the month he wrote to Bernetti:

"The last few days I have not been feeling very well. The way of living in this country and above all the climate do not agree with me. Your Eminence will not believe that yesterday about three o'clock in the afternoon I had to have a light to read *The Times*, and this state of affairs lasted until the evening. At the brightest moments the weather was as at Rome at 11 p.m. on a rainy night in November. For a Roman of cheerful disposition like mine, such weather is really heartbreaking. One feels like sending London to the devil, with all its magnificence and riches, and with all its inhabitants. This heartrending borders on despair, when one thinks that on such days one cheers oneself by eating like Noah or Abraham, that is to say a wretched piece of roast meat and four *erbaggi* (greens?) without salt, and such is the English cuisine that one needs to spend a fortune.

"Mgr. Gradwell suggested that I should go and spend a few days with him in the North of England, and I willingly accepted. We shall start next Monday. If

any commission for your Eminence demands my presence at London, I shall return immediately."

As regards the loan he had been commissioned to raise, Capaccini did not hope for much. He had mentioned the matter to Mgr. Gradwell. "The plan is this. Both he and I have already begun to make the principal English Catholics consider what straits the Holy See must be in, in order to meet its very urgent needs. Our speeches end there, for with the English, when it is a question of money, one has to go very carefully. On our journey we shall also make the same complaint to others."

The Internuncio's journey to the north, in the company of Mgr. Gradwell, is best described in his own words. He wrote to Bernetti from Manchester on 12 May, 1831 :

"On the evening of the tenth I received the letter written me by your Eminence on 19 April, and directed to Mr. Cobb. The letter arrived at London on 3 May, and from there it had to make a long detour to find me, as making this journey with Mgr. Gradwell I was not at liberty to follow exactly the plan that had been proposed to me. I am exceedingly pleased with the appointments we make, as in this manner I am gradually getting to know personally all the English clergy ; your Eminence cannot imagine how much good that does me. One must be in these parts and be admitted to the confidence of these good priests to get a true idea of the flourishing state of religion in this district, of the really solid goodness of the clergy, and of the fervour of the Catholics. I seem to live in the times of the primitive Church when amongst all the faithful *erat cor unum et anima una*. In the two cities of Manchester and Liverpool alone there are already more than 90,000 Catholics, and they say that there is hardly a day that some Protestant is not converted. The priests are continuously arguing with the Protestant ministers and the latter are always beaten, as they say in French, *à plat de couture*. Catholic churches are everywhere being built, since Catholics are everywhere on the increase. A few days ago I saw in a country place a beautiful newly built

Catholic church. Ours is nearly always as full as an egg, and in the Protestant church three-quarters of the benches are empty. I was told that a few days ago, there was found on the door of the Protestant church a notice written in large letters 'To be let'. But another pleasing fact that will make you and the Holy Father smile is the following. Three months ago a Methodist preacher here in Manchester, in order to take up a good collection, announced to the public that the following Sunday he would preach against Papistry to expose the absurd superstition. The Methodist chapel stands in a quarter in which a great many Irish dwell. When these learnt that the following Sunday the preacher would discourse on the subject he had announced, they went in great numbers to hear him, and filled the chapel to such an extent that there only remained sufficient room for the few Methodists who had their own benches. The preacher entered the pulpit and for an hour made himself breathless with shouting without collecting a farthing, and the only result he got from it was to make himself ridiculous by unsuccessful speculation.

"To be really edified one must see the Catholics in church. None turns an eye to left or right, but all assist motionless for hours and hours at the offices that are celebrated. The music in the churches is very beautiful; men and women sing, but with such modesty and recollection that it leaves one quite edified.

"Since the day I left London we have dined daily with all the priests of the district in which we stopped, and also with a few good laymen. They talk of nothing but of religion, the Pope, and Rome. At these dinners, which when they are short last more than two hours, whoever proposes the toast makes a speech in praise of the person to whose health one is asked to drink, and afterwards the person toasted has to make a speech by way of thanks. Let it, therefore, be known to your Eminence, but don't laugh, that every day I am obliged to make three or four of these extempore speeches, maiming the language and pronouncing English barbarously, since the first toast is always for the Pope, and it is for me to reply; there is always one for me, and

often two or three either for the Cardinals or for Propaganda, or for the Holy See in general, and for the Roman clergy. The pride of the English character, which one finds even in the best of individuals, is greatly flattered at the sight of a foreigner trying to speak their tongue, and I see in fact that these ecclesiastics remain greatly attached to me, and I am very glad of it because it is all ultimately for the Holy See and for the Pope. Besides, if the English are proud of their superiority over other nations they have good reason to be so. To give you an example of it, I will tell you that yesterday morning, the weather being very fine, I went to breakfast with the Bishop at Liverpool. I left by the seven o'clock train. I did thirty-two miles in an hour and twenty-seven minutes travelling as if in a litter, and reading the paper, which is printed in very small type. I spent four hours at Liverpool, where I saw seven large steamships set out one after the other. I saw at least two or three thousand boats assembled in the docks there. Then in another hour and a half I was back again in Manchester for dinner at three o'clock, and thus in three hours I travelled sixty-four miles over a road that is a miracle of art, which passes majestically through valleys and hills, now over immense embankments and magnificent bridges, now under overhead bridges that connect the tops of hills that have been cut through, and now traversing the bowels of the earth in magnificent tunnels lit up by gas. What other country is there in the world that has, or that is capable of having, such things?"*

The next letter to Bernetti, which gives an account of the continuation of Capaccini's journey, was written from Liverpool on 17 May.

"After that I will give you an account of the continuation of my journey. On the 13th I left Manchester for Liverpool with Mgr. Gradwell, and in an hour and 28 minutes we had covered the distance of thirty-two miles. Being at Liverpool, I thought I would go over to Dublin, which is only 150 miles distant. I embarked on the steamer *Etna* at half past five on the evening of the 13th, and accompanied by an English priest given

* Capaccini to Bernetti, *ibid.*

me by the Bishop, Mgr. Peonsich [Penswich], we went to Ireland, arriving at Dublin at eight o'clock on the morning of the 14th. We went immediately to call on the Archbishop, but finding him absent for the sake of his health, we visited the Vicar-General, whom I had known personally in Rome. After saying Mass on the 15th, we went to see the Seminary of Maynooth, which is fourteen miles away; we assisted at High Mass and after dinner we left for Liverpool at five o'clock on the steamer *Thetis*. I told the Vicar-General and the Superiors of the Seminary that I went to Ireland with the express intention of giving the Irish clergy a token of the esteem in which the Holy See holds them, also of the personal attachment of the Holy Father and of your Eminence, and for this purpose I had not wished and did not wish to do anything but visit the Archbishop and in his absence the Vicar-General and the Seminary that contains the hopes of the clergy of the whole of Ireland. In this Seminary there are four hundred young men whom I saw with the greatest pleasure all assisting at High Mass. This attention gave the greatest pleasure. I also had in view the preparing of the way for the matter of soldiers and from time to time made some hypothetical proposition, as I had not then received your Eminence's dispatch of 19 April. Yesterday morning at 8.15 I again landed at Liverpool, and this morning at eleven I leave with Mgr. Gradwell for Preston. From there I wanted to go to Edinburgh, but after the dispatches I have received, I don't know whether I shall be able to do so.

"My health is now much better, and the continued good weather and the excitement of the journey have done me a lot of good. As for my staying in England or returning to Rome, I already wrote to your Eminence that, with the present Pope and with the present Secretary of State, my will is yours. Let them do with me whatever they please and I shall always be happy. Would that some opportunity could present itself in which I could show you how willingly I would give my life for the one and for the other. Prescinding from every other consideration, the personal obligations that

I have to both of them are so deeply engraved in my heart that words fail me to express what I feel.”*

The third and last letter that Capaccini wrote to the Secretary of State while on this journey was written at Preston on 26 May. In the meantime he had received two dispatches from Rome. The interests of the Papal Government required his presence in London.

“I would have gone immediately to London to see Lord Palmerston and the other Ministers resident there according to your instructions, but I am obliged to delay my departure for four or five days. Next Saturday, 28 May, a big dinner will be given at the Foreign Office in London to celebrate the King’s birthday. I have been invited like all the other members of the diplomatic corps, but as it is necessary to go in full dress, and I have none, and, on the other hand, as it seems to me too early to have the English papers talking about me, for they would make all sorts of comments on the presence of a Papal diplomat at a dinner of this kind, I thought that this time I would send an excuse to Lord Palmerston. For this reason I cannot let myself be seen in London neither on Saturday the 28th, nor on Sunday, 29th, and so I propose to leave on Monday, postponing till some more suitable occasion the journey I wanted to make to Edinburgh in connexion with some business concerning the Scotch Seminary, with which Propaganda has entrusted me.”

Capaccini had also been asked whether it was possible to find a market in England for alum.

“I have begun to speak about the matter of the alum,” he wrote, “but up to now it seems to me that, as in the case of the loan, one must set about it in a different fashion. In this country one can easily do all sorts of business for profit, but it must be done publicly to be done well. As regards the alum pits, it would be necessary to make an announcement in the papers that the Pontifical Government intended selling the mine with the adjacent ground; also a fine description of the state of the mine and of the value of the cultivable land. In this way competition would be stirred up, and

* Ibid.

as the business may be very useful to anyone who has means enough for a great undertaking, I am assured that there will probably be a lot of competition. On my way to London next Monday, I will stop at Manchester to speak to someone who owns an immense cotton mill where much alum is used, and I will also get his opinion. He is a Catholic, but Catholics or Protestants, Quakers or Jews, when it is a matter of profit here in England, they are all of the same class, they want to see the thing clearly, and they want to make a sure and pretty profit. When the waters are set in motion and competition has been excited, then it is possible that someone out of jealousy of another may offer better conditions, and be content to gain a little. On the other hand my connexions in England up to the present are only diplomatic or ecclesiastical, and these give no facilities in a country where the Government does not undertake commercial speculations or private business, and where the clergy can only think of religion; they do not offer, I say, facilities for doing well and quickly business of the kind with which your Eminence has charged me.”*

By the middle of July, Capaccini was again feeling very tired of London life. Partly owing to the climate—it had been raining for five days on end and he had to have a light in order to see to write even at midday—and partly owing to worry about the political situation in the Papal States, he was feeling melancholy beyond all conception.

“The only thing I ask of you”, he wrote to Bernetti on 15 July, “is to liberate me from the Dutch Mission,” his internunciature, “for if a revolution breaks out at Rome or at Bologna, or at Civitavecchia, in a word in our dominions, and I am not paid for a month, I cannot live here. In such a bad case I shall go and stay with a friend in Belgium, and thus get out of the difficulty, but here is written over every door: ‘Everyone for himself and God for us all’. I cannot understand why you will not loose me from a marriage where neither I nor others, at least at present, can make the family happy. Although the climate does me physical harm I resign

* Ibid.

myself as difficulties at present are so great, but if a revolution comes, and I am not paid, how shall I get on? At Brussels I shall manage, as they are fond of me there. At the Hague also I could manage, but I should be useless in that crow's nest [*pozzo di cornacchie*]. But here, without money, one can die of hunger without anyone taking the slightest notice. You and Peppe have been here and you know I am not exaggerating.*

"Oh, for many days I have been unable to prevent myself thinking of the great difficulties in which the Holy Father finds himself.

"I assure you that I fear I shall go mad. I would like to help you with all my soul and body, and being unable to be at hand causes me such grief that only the thought that I am here at the express wish of him who has a right to all my love prevents me from doing something foolish [*m'impedisce di far qualche budellate*]."[†]

One of the last letters that he wrote from London leaves him again complaining of his health and the weather. "My health is as usual. I am not ill, but I am not well, and above all I suffer from the climate, that is to say a profound melancholy increased by the state of our affairs, and by my excessive sensibility."[‡] But he did not have to wait much longer for his release. The above-quoted letter of 15 July received a prompt answer entirely complying with Capaccini's wishes. Bernetti wrote on 10 August announcing the Holy Father's decision to recall him to Rome. At the moment it was useless to return to the Hague. "Moreover, after the conciliation of the affairs of Italy, advantageous to all except ourselves, there is no longer any reason for the Holy See to retain in England one of its Agents who is accredited to another Court."[§]

The exact date of Capaccini's departure from England, like that of his arrival, is uncertain, but in all probability

* This letter was addressed to Mr. Paul Massani, described by the Austrian Ambassador in Rome as Bernetti's "homme de confiance" (Lutzow to Metternich, 31 December, 1831; Vienna, Staatsarchiv, Rom Varia 43). Who Peppe was I don't know, nor whether Massani or Bernetti was ever in England.

† Capaccini to Bernetti, 15 July, 1831, *ibid*.

‡ Capaccini to Bernetti, 12 August, 1831, *ibid*.

§ Bernetti to Capaccini, 10 August, 1831, *ibid*.

it was early in September, as he would have received Bernetti's note recalling him on 27 August. This time he returned via Paris, where he had an audience of Louis Philippe. But he had not proceeded far on his journey when he fell ill.

"You will be surprised to receive this letter from Sens, which is only 28 leagues from Paris", he wrote to Bishop Gradwell on 8 October. "The fact is that for the last seven days I have been detained in this city, suffering from serious inflammation of the stomach and of the bowels. They have taken four pounds of blood from me, and kept me on a rigid diet, and in spite of that my pulse is again so strong that it is beating eighty to the minute. I feel much relieved and on the road to recovery and I hope to be able to continue my journey within four or five days.

"King Louis Philippe, the Queen, and Madame d'Orléans, who received me with the greatest kindness at Paris, have condescended to send the Queen's Chaplain to see the state of my health for himself. The Archbishop [of Sens] is most attentive and wanted me to leave the inn where I am and to go and stay with him, but as I am well looked after here in the inn I thanked the Archbishop for his courtesy.

"Please give my news to Bishop Bramston and Mr. Tuite [the V.G.], to Mr. Baldacconi [of the Sardinian Chapel], and if it is not troubling you to the excellent family of Cobb, who have shown me such attachment. I am not writing to Mr. Cobb as my head won't stand the strain of writing in English."*

On 27 October, Capaccini finally reached Rome, where he received a very warm welcome both from the Pope and the Cardinal Secretary of State.

NICHOLAS J. KELLY.

* Westminster Diocesan Archives.

METROPOLITAN MAN

Metropolitan Man. By Robert Sinclair. (Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d. net.)

NATIONALISM and Internationalism wage war upon each other. Politically minded men may express the opinion that national wars belong to the same past as religious wars, and that the battle line of the future will be between Fascists and Anti-Fascists or Communists. Wise men may hesitate to form any opinion, because they are unable to see any difference of a fundamental character between Fascism and Communism. One thing, however, is clear to a careful observer of world politics. It is the peculiarity of urbanization. It is in the slums of great cities that political movements awaken. The cry of the infant may not be heard until it shrieks in a luxurious metropolitan drawing-room, but it is in towns that Fascism and Communism grow. They have plans and schemes for the countryside, since the permanence of a political system depends upon its rural support. The power-house of modern political movements is the town.

The town has always felt a superiority over the countryside, a superiority not always justified, as La Fontaine's fable about the two rats showed. It is therefore worth while for the political student to study the problem of the urban and suburban citizen, to collate the facts and endeavour to read into them a meaning which will be of guidance for the future. Mr. Robert Sinclair, in his book *Metropolitan Man*, has chosen this subject, directing his inquiries to the greatest of all cities—London.

Towards the end of his book Mr. Sinclair provides a key. He writes :

This book is the result of personal curiosity. With a measure of racial pride, and knowing the physical accomplishments of my generation, I decided as a young man to survey the place in which I shall have to live my life and the claims to respect and toleration which my tribe makes upon me. I find that I am living in a dirty and dilapidated tenement, with a family many of whom are diseased,

many more undisciplined and still more misled. The greatest metropolis of the twentieth century is dirty, poor, unorganized, factious, ignorant, aimless and leaderless. One in three of its wretched inhabitants dies in the workhouse.

Such is the measure of civilization offered to me by my ancient family, which bids me worship cobwebs because they are draped on escutcheons. I am ashamed. . . .

Blue-books, parliamentary papers, local-government reports, the files of *The Times* have all been searched for the facts set forth in a most readable style by Mr. Sinclair. Six hundred and forty references support the facts narrated on three hundred and twenty-three pages. They are a collection of grim and unpalatable facts, leaving in their trail a sense of hopelessness, for they are not even redeemed by the colour of exaggeration.

My distillation has been merely commonsensical arithmetic, and the compounds distilled were not my own. All the facts I have passed on to you were already public property—for those who could find them. They lurked in the backwoods, many of them disguised, but they were there.

And the value of those facts, their guarantee, lies in their being public property. They are the published accounts of our public authorities.

Judge this book on the facts with which it deals, and not on any opinion of mine. But if you accept the facts as I accept them, then you and I must necessarily see very much the same picture of the world around us.

That is all.

These are the words which conclude the story of the Metropolitan Man. The book, judged in the light of that plea, may be said to have achieved its purpose. Its purpose is, however, negative, for there is not one constructive suggestion in the whole book. Mr. Sinclair has gone into a yard, collected all the old tin cans, old clothes, broken boxes, and miscellaneous rubbish, including tattered Sanitary and Housing notices. He has tabulated them, worked out a host of statistical conclusions to prove that they are what they are known to be, and does not even suggest a fire as an effective remedy.

Beyond the fact that he is industrious, the author gives no hint of his personality. He may still be young,

for he takes a delight in using uncommon words such as "laparatomist", "phagocytic", and "hypnopaedic". The use of these odd words may no longer be a sign of youth, they may indicate a solitary student, for this habit is to be found in the memoirs of men who have led solitary lives, having educated themselves in libraries. An acute sense of observation is displayed, but it is unsatisfying, for it is the absorption of water by a sponge rather than the intelligent and critical personal collection of illuminating facts.

The basis of Communism and Fascism is rooted in materialism. Certain physical goals are aimed at, certain material facts are taken, and then a logical plan is evolved. This plan is put forward as a panacea—and the trouble begins. It is the same trouble which would face the builder of a house who left cement out of his materials and ignored the vagaries of wind and weather. The human being is the cement, spiritual and religious motives and inspiration are the wind and weather. The deliberate ignoring of a God removes from all these otherwise excellent plans any possibility of their ultimate success. Take God away and the structure of all ideals is removed. Justice, Mercy, Honesty, and Kindliness have no place in a materialistic organization of society. Expediency and subservience dominate all rational planning. Logic *in vacuo* loses its truth when it finds itself tested by the irresponsibility of human beings. The brain and ingenuity of man can devise schemes which, based upon past statistics and laws of average, may appear perfect on paper, but an epidemic, a drought, a flood, or a war will knock over all the clear-cut conclusions as a well-directed ball will send spinning a row of ninepins.

Mr. Sinclair tells us that one in every twenty children born in London is illegitimate; that one in every 378 of London's population passes through the police-courts during the course of the year; that one in thirty is dependent on the London rates: but he does not tell us how many people go to church on Sundays; he does not tell how many people believe in God. He does not even suggest that much happiness and consolation is

derived from a belief in God; he never considers whether courage or inspiration flows from a trust in God. To him the existence of God is meaningless, and I cannot recall in this book the use once of the word God, in the midst of 150,000 words. The answer may be that the reports and documents which have so zealously been read and searched themselves make no reference to God. They are concerned with man. Man can be tabulated. God cannot be put in a workhouse, He cannot be included among those who are sick or who are given relief. He has no place in criminal statistics or in infantile mortality. Thus God is of no use to the statistician. Yet God watches in the prisons; the sick and the infirm are of interest to Him. His will alone makes possible vital statistics.

The force of this criticism is seen even from a glance at the jacket, on which appears the following phrase: "90,000 future suicides are walking the streets of London today." If there is no God, what does it matter how many people commit suicide? What is the relevance of such a statement? Wherein lies its significance? This dramatic statement illustrates the danger of statistics. "London's official rate is 167 per million," writes Mr. Sinclair, "which does not seem much. But that means 167 suicides in a year to a million living: when 705 of the 51,700 who die in a year in the inner county are suicides we see their proportion to be one in seventy-three of the whole of the dead in that year: of all men who leave their mortal shell, one in seventy-three hastens his passing by his own hand. So that the real suicide rate, which he who runs may read, is 13,700 per million deaths. Unless something happens to deflect the suicide line, which has been rising for years in the graph of London, 57,000 people who are alive at this moment in the inner county are predestined to suicide, or 90,000 in Greater London (the rate is lower in the outer suburbs)."

Mr. Sinclair's mathematics are excellent, but his answers may be quite wrong. It may well be true that 705 persons commit suicide in Inner London, but unless one is informed how many of those 705 came to London

to commit suicide (it must be remembered that a not inconsiderable proportion of suicides take place in hotels and lodging-houses) it is impossible to proceed to the further calculations which are made. For example, if ten per cent of the suicides came to London to destroy themselves, then the 57,000 in inner London is reduced by nearly 6000, and the disproportion between Inner and Outer London may be affected. Mr. Sinclair then proceeds to analyse some of the published facts about suicides. Twice as many women commit suicide today as sixty years ago; many do so in their twenties. The greater number of men who commit suicide does so about the age of sixty. At the end of this analysis the position is summed up in the conclusion "that each one of us has an increased chance of living longer and of dying by suicide".

There is no attempt to trace the causes of suicide, no attempt to discover what sort of people commit suicide, no reflection upon the morality of suicide. A real analysis might disclose that ninety per cent of suicides were people who practised no religion, that a similar proportion were people who had committed a social if not a moral wrong, that suicides were, for the greater part, educated or semi-educated people, that the really poor hardly ever committed suicide. Such facts would give a real colour to those dramatic figures. They would prove that those figures have nothing to do with the problem of urbanization.

Again, Mr. Sinclair tells us that one in twenty London babies is illegitimate (in Westminster and Marylebone the figure is one in eight); the number of illegitimates has increased in London by 37 per cent in ten years. Does Mr. Sinclair invite us to draw any conclusion from this fact? On the contrary he leaves it and passes on. Yet it is one which repays analysis. How is it that in a town where girls are more worldly wise than in the country, where a knowledge of contraceptives is widespread, and where it is said the practice of abortion is growing, the proportion of illegitimate births is increasing? Investigation would probably reveal that more than half the illegitimates born in London were con-

ceived outside London, that the mothers came to London to hide their shame and deliver their child. If that be the truth, and anyone familiar with social work in London will know that it is somewhere near the truth, then the increase of 37 per cent assumes a wholly different meaning.

One final example may be taken of the danger of dealing with figures. Court drunks are said to be five times more numerous in London, considering the population, than in the rest of the country. In the soberest peace-time year ever known in the records of Inner London, 1932, there was one such case to every 378 of the population. In the rest of England and Wales there was one to every 1922 people. The famous "West End" is in Inner London. Marlborough Street, Bow Street, and Marylebone are the police-courts which serve that West End, and they are the courts where a very large proportion of the Inner London drunks appear in an unshaven and dejected condition on the morrow. How many of those Inner London drunks are foreigners and provincials? The answer to that question may upset the whole equilibrium of those interesting calculations. Mr. Sinclair does appear to sense this possibility, for he says, "It must not be thought that one Londoner in 378 stands in the dock: one person may be dealt with a dozen times in twelve months. But 14,000 appearances a year do mean 14,000 cases of street bestiality or of behaviour which imperils the sot's life in traffic." The one in 378 has no meaning. No cause or explanation is given, so no lesson can be learnt.

Yet withal Mr. Sinclair's book is worth reading. He has indeed collected the rubbish and put it on a heap. He clamours for a plan. "London is without plan. It has never been planned in the past, it is not planned now; every day the accretions of individual efforts increase the obstacles which will impede possible future planning, yet the accretions continue." This is well written and does much to justify the writing of the book. London, we are informed, has 109 bodies of the town-council kind and 246 other bodies with statutory powers of public regulation, whilst 6390 amateur legislators and administrators serve these numerous bodies. "A plan, a plan,

my city for a plan" is the author's cry. He gives no hint of any possible plan that will organize efficiently ten million people herded together in a small area. He does not suggest that such a plan would be wanted, that it would bring happiness, or that the human race would be the better because of it. Instead he directs a stream of sarcasm against what he contemptuously terms the shopkeeper town-councillor. The shopkeeper town-councillor may still survive, but he no longer dominates the council chambers of the metropolis. When men of the eminence of Professor Laski and Dr. Monckton Copeman are serving on London borough councils this class of criticism is seen to destroy itself. Today London is co-ordinated as it has never been before. The London Standing Joint Committee co-ordinates the London boroughs, the London County Council (for the past three years in Socialist hands) co-operates and dovetails its activities with Socialist and Conservative borough councils. The needs of London are beginning to express themselves and in consequence are beginning to be assuaged.

The metropolitan man may appear to be a pathetic creature, hemmed in by worries and petty tyrannies, governed impersonally, ill cared for in sickness, and allowed to die in poverty. That may be a picture legitimately drawn from statistics, but it is not a true one. A stroll through half a dozen streets in London will reveal a different picture. The cockney wit is by no means dead. On buses, at street corners, in public houses and shops, the humour that is perhaps the real hall-mark of the Londoner is constantly heard and enjoyed. That humour betokens the courageous spirit which faces life and its difficulties without flinching. It is not a sign of despair or oppression. It indicates, whatever the suicide figures may show, that life is considered to be worth the living. From listening to snatches of conversation the inquiring stroller might turn his eyes to observe the children, most of whom give an appearance of being adequately nourished and clothed. An observant eye will also notice the extent to which London caters for the amusement and relaxation of the ordinary citizen.

Theatres and luxurious restaurants, expensive night clubs, and the famous West-End social clubs are not features of importance to the social student. Cinemas, small restaurants, tennis clubs, tennis courts and cricket pitches on open grounds are, however, matters of importance. They tell a tale of living life, of extra money and of happiness.

These are facts which ordinary observation discloses. But neither these facts nor Mr. Sinclair's figures give a real picture. London has a personality. Any returning traveller leaving Victoria or Waterloo, on seating himself in a bus, taxi, or tube, with his grip in his hand, will be able to recall the sensation of being back in London. When he reaches his locality he will be welcomed by friendly inquiries—inquiries which will be sincere, but discreet, for personal privacy and its recognition are among the few real benefits of urban civilization. London as the hub of the universe for forty-five million people, to use Mr. Sinclair's opening words, is a glittering stone with magnetic powers. It attracts the ambitious, the pleasure-seekers, the spenders, the adventurous, the humbugs, and the frauds. It gives to all who approach it a welcome, a chance; and if, as is so often the case, failure smothers the high hopes and lofty ambitions, it supports those who fall by the wayside. It protects those who come under its umbrella and yet—and this perhaps most important of all—it allows, despite the quips at "Dora", a greater real freedom than any other great centre. There may be less licence in London, for the few, than in Paris or New York, but there is more liberty for the many.

The town-councillor who is whipped by Mr. Sinclair is by no means so inefficient when the results of his work are examined. It is one thing to plan and build a city in a desert spot with all the resources of knowledge and science accumulated during the course of centuries. It is altogether a different task to improve upon that which already exists, to enlarge and develop as it grows. It is the difference between educating a child and civilizing an adult barbarian.

"Let us get the smell of the town-councillor out of

our nostrils", writes Mr. Sinclair, "and turn to his master and ally, the London business man. He is an important figure, and we may wonder whether the muddle of the mart of nations may fairly be laid at his door." Apparently the author is satisfied that this is the case, for a few pages later he writes of the business man: "Imitator or not, the business man is the laziest and least effective member of the occupied classes." It is undoubtedly true that business is dishonestly, and therefore badly, conducted in the City of London today. A man's word is no longer his bond, and his bond is frequently only worth the paper upon which it is written. Plans and control might at first sight be thought to be a remedy. Acts of Parliament such as the Companies Acts provide a plan, and the Larceny Acts, backed by the policeman, afford what ought to be sufficient control. The muddle, however, remains, and the inefficiency is not removed. The answer is that whereas once upon a time God had some part in the life of the City, He has been banished from its tabernacles. Materialism has replaced God. The divine handmaidens of Justice and Brotherly Love have been chased from the Temple, to be replaced by the satellites of Mammon, Fear, Expediency, and Ignorance.

If we take for one moment some of the figures used by Mr. Sinclair we will find therein ample corroboration of this view. He contends that the Londoner with an income of £1000 per annum works for four months of the year to find the money required by the State and the town-councillor. He analyses this 30 per cent: for war, 13·8 per cent; sick, poor, unemployed, 6·6 per cent; education 3·3 per cent; and everything else 6·3 per cent. Translate these figures into the terms used above: Fear, 13·8 per cent; Fear and Expediency, 6·6 per cent; Expediency, 3·3 per cent; and Ignorance 6·3 per cent.

The real difficulty in dealing with the social and political problem of the metropolitan man lies in simplifying the problem. If it is approached by Mr. Sinclair's method of statistics the student finds himself in a forest of conflicting facts. He collects certain data and draws

inferences. On these inferences he elaborates a theory and then produces a plan. Perhaps he is cautious. If so, he will collect a few more facts and proceed along his previous lines. He will discover that his logic, although the same, leads him to different conclusions. He will then either become an anarchist or a madman, or he will despair. That is the logic of the position. In fact, he will probably evolve a third theory and persevere. That is not logic. It is human ; it is the reality. Facts should not be the basis of building or dreaming. Man should never be imprisoned in plans. Principles based upon God and truth should be the starting-point. Lack of justice and absence of brotherly love have lain at the root of most social upheavals, whilst they have certainly been the driving force behind revolutions.

Applying these considerations to the problem of the metropolitan man, a new aspect of this problem will be disclosed. The 13,000 insanitary underground dwellings in the wealthy borough of Kensington have a new meaning. Those squalid homes, the breeders of illness, vice, and immorality, are the result of material greed : a greed which seeks to make unjust profit out of land ; a greed which offends against justice, which ignores brotherly love ; a greed whose inspiration is materialism and which ignores God. Mr. Sinclair has, however, the courage to tell us that good housing is not always an unmixed blessing, for the high rents often result in bad feeding. Here again we are confronted with the evidence of greed and lack of brotherly love. That is why Socialism has such a powerful and vibrant message. That is why radicalism made such progress in the nineteenth century. If the problem of rent could be or was solved, then most of the evils which burden the metropolitan man would be removed.

That 160,000 citizens of Inner London are helped to live by Poor Law charity is one of the numerical facts brought forward in this book. "One person in thirty is dependent on the London rates." Looked at as mere figures, these facts are appalling. They may, however, be looked upon from a different angle. A nation, a community, is a whole, just as is a human body. If the

toe is sore or the eyes are strained, it is in the interest of the rest of the body that the toe should be healed or the eyes relieved. The body, however, is made up of material parts. The community on the other hand is not composed of material parts. It is made up of human beings, independent and interdependent. They have individual and collective rights. Each one has a soul, a will, and a power to do right and wrong. If illness, misfortune, or some other evil has befallen 160,000 out of the ten million members of a community, it is obviously in the interest of that community that those 160,000 should be looked after during the period of their misfortune. The realization of that fact means the awakening of a civic conscience. But conscience has no significance unless it is related to God, for conscience has no true place in a materialistic community, dominated with ideas of efficiency and expediency. The 160,000 on Poor Law charity, looked at in this light, become brothers. It is not a question of considering them as a festering sore. If that were the case they would be treated as 160,000 diseased animals who would be destroyed. We do not destroy such people in cold blood, because they are human beings, and human beings differ from animals because they have a soul, and they have a soul because God gave them one.

That is why Socialism without a root in God has no real logic. Socialism with a theistic basis has a new and a real meaning. It connotes the awakening of a social conscience, a determination on the part of the masses to ensure that individuals will cease to do wrongs, will be prevented from violating the laws of justice. It is not a real restraint upon liberty, it is a check upon licence, extortion, and injustice.

The commercial importance of saying things rather than doing things has even led to the revival of old forms of persuasion. In 1932 a greater number of young men took Holy Orders than in any year since before the war.

The result of a couple of generations of ballyhoo has been to make the river of thought run backwards in the minds of Londoners.

What can Mr. Sinclair mean by this in his chapter

headed "The Card-index Home" ? What significance can it have other than that, in his opinion, opinions are formed merely by swaying propaganda, and that priests, ministers of God, are parasites in a human community ? What it really means, surely, is that at last, after the indigestible meal of materialism during the Great War, many young men are turning to God and in a spirit of brotherly love are trying to help their fellow-men spiritually, if not materially.

Mr. Sinclair's book has no message ; it is not infected with any germ that will spread either for good or for evil. It has, however, a certain dramatic sensationalism in its compilation of grim figures which will attract attention and perhaps occasion thought. That seems to have been Mr. Sinclair's purpose. If it does attract attention it may in so doing cause people—thinking people—to realize the evils of materialism. It may help them to understand better the meaning of Fascism and Communism. It may, and I hope it will, help them to look at their neighbour as an individual. Somewhere in that mass of statistics the neighbour is to be found. Once that awakening takes place the metropolitan man may become a more important and a more real person. He will assume an individual significance. From being the neighbour he becomes the very person who is reflecting. It is then, and only when the citizen realizes that when he is acting as a citizen he is acting for himself as well as for others, that he becomes an effective citizen. Conscious of his own soul, he becomes conscious of the soul of others. If he be a landlord his conscience is awakened, and if he is honest with himself he becomes a good landlord. If he is an employer he realizes his responsibilities. If he is a worker he acknowledges his duties. The individual thus sees himself as an important entity in a great whole.

Those who have the privilege and duty, by reason of their ability, to lead the thoughts of others must be careful that their leadership is not blind and does not lack direction. Facts are undoubtedly of great use to any student, but they are apt to become useless unless it is realized that situations rarely repeat themselves with-

out some variation. Lawyers have a tag that the "all-four precedent" is a snare and a delusion. That warning is as important in the wider sphere of politics and social study. Mr. Sinclair's book will find a useful place on a library shelf as an index. It will never become a real book for reference. It gives facts which can and will be misinterpreted, but it fails to provoke real interest because it lacks life. The author has failed to infuse any real personality into his work. He writes in his chapter under the heading of "Freedom" :

The lives of the humbler of these people are as elective as the flutterings of the cuckoo in a cuckoo-clock: the lives of their captains are as elective as that of a retired racehorse at stud.

These are the robots, and it is to those characteristics in their lives that I refer by "robotization": it is an ugly word, but a just one.

A robot is Mr. Sinclair's metropolitan man, a person described and tabulated by reference to inanimate or almost inanimate things. The Londoner is an extremely animated creature, triumphing over his difficulties, though sometimes his path is that of muddle. He is a lively creature with a spirit, a soul. It is the soul that Mr. Sinclair has never seen. It is because he has not seen that soul that the book has no message, no life, and no lesson, and will never be anything but an index.

STANISLAUS SEUFFERT.

CATHOLICS AND THE WOOLSACK

A RECENT reassertion, this time in the *Tablet*, that a Catholic may not occupy the Woolsack prompts the inquiry whether this is good law. Against it, we may set two weighty legal opinions, the one official and the other professional. The former was that of an Attorney-General who became Lord Coleridge and Lord Chief Justice of England, and the latter that of a no less distinguished member of the Bar, who became Lord Haldane and Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain. It may be premised, in the words of Mr. W. S. Lilly and Mr. J. E. P. Wallis in their *Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics* :

Catholics were not *by law* excluded from any of the offices in question. There was merely imposed on all holders, Catholic and Protestant alike, a declaration and an oath, which no Catholic could conscientiously take ; and a Catholic who went through the form of taking them, however insincerely and dishonestly, would have satisfied the statutes.*

The question, then, is not—and never was—"Are Catholics forbidden the Woolsack ?" They never have been. The question is simply, "Is a Catholic, before acting as Chancellor, required to make any oaths or declarations which as a Catholic he is bound to reject ?"

In 1872, then, Sir Colman O'Loughlen brought in a Bill to open various high offices of State to Catholics, whom he supposed to be excluded therefrom ; and amongst these offices was the Lord Chancellorship. Before proceeding with it, he asked the Attorney-General from his place in the House (6 May, 1872), "if according to existing law, any religious qualification is necessary for the office of Lord Chancellor of England or Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland ; and especially whether a Roman Catholic or a Jew, or either of them, is eligible to hold either or both of the said offices". The Attorney-General returned a closely reasoned reply, which sum-

* For a period, Catholics were in effect excluded also by the Statutory requirement to take "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the usage of the Church of England".

marized the effect of a series of statutes. He prefaced his reply with a reference to "Lord Coke, who, being asked by James I a question of law, desired to know in return whether it was one of common law or statute law?—because, he said, if it were one of common law he could answer it in bed, but if it were one of statute law he must get up and examine the statutes". The reply was, in brief, a declaration of Catholic eligibility, a view which, it may be assumed, was shared by his colleague, Sir George Jessel, then Solicitor-General, and subsequently Master of the Rolls—another very eminent lawyer. In view of the Attorney-General's reply, Sir Colman concluded that his Bill was superfluous, and he did not further proceed with it.

The reply pointed out that the provisions which had had the effect of excluding Catholics from the Woolsack were first created by 25 Car. II, c. 2, "An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants". This statute enacted:

That all and every person or persons as well Peers as Commoners that shall beare any Office or Offices Civill or Military or shall receive any Pay, Salary, Fee or Wages by reason of any Patent or Grant from His Majestie or shall have Command or Place of Trust from, or under His Majestie . . . shall . . . take the severall Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance which Oath of Allegiance is contained in a Statute made in the third yeare of King James by Law established.

The Act goes on to extend the above requirement to "all and every person or persons that shall be admitted, entered, placed, or taken into any" of the above-named offices.

And be it further enacted . . . That all and every the person or persons aforesaid that doe or shall neglect or refuse to take the said Oathes . . . shall be ipso facto adjudged uncapable and disabled in Law to all intents and purposes whatsoever to have occupy or enjoy the said office. . . . And every such office . . . shall be void and is hereby adjudged void. . . . And bee it further enacted . . . That at the same time when the persons concerned in this Act shall take the aforesaid Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance, they shall likewise make and subscribe

this Declaration following. . . . "I, A. B., doe declare that I doe beleive that there is not any Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, or in the elements of Bread and Wine, at, or after the Consecration thereof by any person whatsoever."

The Oath of Allegiance referred to is to be found in 3 Jac. I, c. 4 ("An Acte for the better discovering and repressing of Popish Recusants").

I A. B. doe truly and sincerely acknowledge p[re]s[en]tly testifie and declare in my conscience before God and the Worlde, That our Sovereigne Lorde Kinge James is lawfull and rightfull King of this Realme and of all other His Majesties Dominions and Countries; And that the Pope, neither of himselfe, nor by any Authority of the Churche or Sea of Rome, or by any other meanes with any other, hath any Power or Authority to depose the King or to dispose any of his Majestie's Kingdomes or Dominions, or to authorize any Forraigne Prince to invade or annoy hym or his Countries, or to discharge any of his Subjects of their Allegiaunce and Obedience to his Majestie, or to give Licence or Leave to any of them to beare Armes raise Tumult or to offer any violence or hurte to his Majestie's Royall Pson State or Government or to any of his Majestie's subjects within his Majestie's Dominions. Also I doe sweare from my heart, that notwithstanding any Declaracon or Sentence of Excommunicacon or Deprivacon made or graunted or to be made or graunted by the Pope or his Successors, or by any Authoritie derived or ptended to be derived from hym or his Sea against the saide Kinge his Heires or Successors, or any Absolution of the said Subjects from their Obedience; I will beare Faithe and true Allegiaunce to his Majestie his Heires and Successors, and hym or them will defend to the uttermost of my power against all Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever which shalbe made against his or their persons their Crowne and Dignitie by reason or colour of any such sentence or Declaracon, or otherwise, and will doe my best endeavour to disclose and make knowen unto his Majestie his Heires and Successors all Treasons and traitorous conspiracies which I shall knowe or heare of to be against hym or any of them. And I doe further sweare that I doe from my heart abhor detest and adjure as impious and hereticall this damnable Doctrine and Position that Princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their Subjects or any other whatsoever. And I doe beleieve and in my conscience am resolved, that neither the Pope nor any pson whatsoever hath power to absolve me of this Oath

or any part thereof, which I acknowledge by good and full Authoritye to be lawfully ministred unto mee, and doe renounce all Pardons and Dispensacons to the contrarie; And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and sweare, according to these expresse wordes by me spoken, and according to the playne and comon sense and understanding of the same wordes without any equivocacon or mentall evasion or secret reservacon whatsoever; And I doe make this recognicon and acknowledgment heartily willingly and truly upon the true Faithe of a Christian; So help me God.

The Oath of Supremacy required is to be found in 1 Eliz., c 1 ("An Acte restoring to the Crowne thaucyent Jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiasticall and Spuall, and abolyshing all Forreine Power repugnant to the same"). This provided "a corporall othe upon the Evangelist" in the following terms:

I, A.B., doo utterly testifie and declare in my Conscience, that the Quenes Highnes is thonelye supreme Governour of this Realme and of all other her Highnes Dominions and Countreys, aswell in all Spuall or Ecclesiastical Thinges or Causes as Temporall, and that no forreine Prince Pson Prelate State or Potentate hathe or oughte to have any Jurisdiccon, Power Superioritee Prehem, inence or Aucthoritee Ecclesiasticall or Spuall within this Realme and therefore I doo utterly renounce and forsake all forraine Jurisdiccons, Powers, Supiorities and Auctorities, and doo promise that from hensforthe I shall beare Faithe and true Allegiance to the Quenes Highnes her Heires & lawful successours, & to my power shall assist & defende all Jurisdiccons, Preheminenes privileges and Auctorities granted or belonging to the Quenes Highnes her Heires and Successors, or united or annexed to thimperial Crowne of this Realme; So helpe me God & by the Contentes of this Booke.

The next relevant statute was 30 Car. II, st. 2, c. 1 ("An Act for the more effectuall preserving the King's Person & Government by disableing Papists from sitting in either House of Parlyament"). It provided as follows:

Forasmuch as diverse good laws have beene made for preventing the Increase & Danger of Popery in this Kingdome, which have not had the desired effects by reason of the free accesse which Popish Recusants have had to his Majestyes Court & by reason

of the Liberty which of late some of the Recusants have had & taken to sitt & vote in Parliament. Wherefore & for the Safety of His Majesty's Royall Person & Government. Bee it enacted . . . that . . . Noe Person that now is or hereafter shall be a Peere of this Realme or Member of the House of Peeres shall vote or make his Proxie in the House of Peeres or sitt there during any Debate in the said House of Peeres, Nor any person that now is or hereafter shall be a Member of the House of Commons shall vote in the House of Commons or sitt there during any Debate in the said House of Commons after their Speaker is chosen untill such Peere or Member shall from time to time respectively & in manner following first take the severall Oathes of Allegiance & Supremacy & make subscribe and audibly repeate this Declaration following :

I, A.B. doe solemnly & sincerely in the presence of God professe Testifie and declare that I doe believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever ; And that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the sacrifice of the Masse as they are now used in the Church of Rome are superstitious and idolatrous, And I doe solemnly in the presence of God professe Testifie and declare that I make this Declaration and every part thereof in the plaine and ordinary sence of the words read unto me as they are commonly understood by English Protestants without any Evasion, Equivocation, or Mentall Reservation whatsoever, and without any Dispensation already granted to me for this purpose by the Pope or any other Authority or Person whatsoever or without any hope of such Dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or Man or absolved of this Declaration or any part thereof although the Pope or any other Person or Persons or Power whatsoever should dispencc with or annull the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.

At the accession of the Hanoverians, Parliament passed "An Act for the further security of his Majesty's Person and Government and the succession of the Crown to the Heirs of the late Princess Sophia, being Protestants ; and for extinguishing the hopes of the pretended Prince of Wales and his open and secret Abbettors" (1 Geo. I, st. 2, c. 13). In this it was enacted that all peers, commons, officers civil and military in Great Britain and the Channel Islands, all ecclesiastical persons, all schoolmasters, lawyers,

etc., residing within thirty miles of London should take the following oaths before the end of the next legal term and thereafter before the end of the term following their appointment to or qualification for such positions.

(1) I, A.B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithfull and bear true allegiance to his Majesty King George.
So help me God.

(2) I, A.B., do swear, that I do from my Heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical that damnable Doctrine and Position, That Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any Authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare, That no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate hath or ought to have any Jurisdiction Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this Realm.
So help me God.

(3) I, A.B., do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify and declare on my conscience, before God and the World, That our Sovereign Lord King George is lawful and rightful King of this Realm and all other his Majesty's Dominions and Countries thereunto belonging. And I do solely and sincerely declare, That I do believe in my conscience, that the Person Pretended to be Prince of Wales during the life of the late King James, and since his decease, pretending to be and taking upon himself the stile and title of King of England, by the Name of James the Third, or of Scotland by the Name of James the Eighth, or the stile and Title of King of Great Britain, hath not any Right or Title whatsoever to the Crown of this Realm, or any other the Dominions thereunto belonging; And I do renounce, refuse and abjure any Allegiance or Obedience to him. And I do swear, That I will bear Faith and True Allegiance to His Majesty King George, and him will defend to the utmost of my power, against all traiterous conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever which shall be made against his Person, Crown or Dignity. And I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to His Majesty and his successors, all Treasons and Traiterous conspiracies which I shall know to be against him, or any of them. And I do faithfully promise, to the utmost of my Power to support, maintain and defend the succession of the Crown against him, the said James, and all other Persons whatsoever, which succession, by an Act intituled, "An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown and better securing the Rights & Liberties of the Subject" is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electoress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the Heirs of her Body being Protestants.

And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same Words, without any Equivocation, mental Evasion, or secret Reservation whatsoever. And I do make this Recognition, Acknowledgment, Abjuration, Renunciation and Promise heartily, willingly & truly, upon the True Faith of a Christian.

So help me God.

The next stage, apart from an Act (9 Geo. II, c. 26) extending the time for taking the oaths to six months, was the "Roman Catholic Relief Act, 1829". The preamble of this ran as follows :

Whereas by certain Acts of Parliament certain Restraints and Disabilities are imposed on the Roman Catholic subjects of His Majesty, to which other subjects of His Majesty are not liable ; And whereas it is expedient that such restraints and disabilities shall be from henceforth discontinued. And whereas by various Acts certain oaths and certain Declarations, commonly called the Declaration against Transubstantiation and the Invocation of Saints and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as practised in the Church of Rome are or may be required to be taken, made or subscribed by the Subjects of His Majesty as Qualifications for sitting and voting in Parliament and for the enjoyment of certain Offices Franchises and Civil Rights.

The Act went on to provide :

That from and after the commencement of this Act all such parts of the said Acts as require the said Declarations, or either of them, to be made or subscribed by any of His Majesty's subjects as a qualification for sitting and voting in Parliament or for the Exercise or Enjoyment of any Office Franchise or Civil Right be and the same are (save as hereinafter provided and excepted) hereby repealed.

Section 2 provided that Catholics might sit and vote in Parliament on taking the oath provided, which was acceptable to them ; but section 12 added :

Provided also and be it further enacted That nothing herein contained shall extend . . . to enable any person otherwise than he is now by law enabled, to hold or enjoy the office of Lord Chancellor.

Referring to this Act, the Attorney-General pointed out that it was commonly supposed that it excluded Roman Catholics from certain offices. His opinion was that such an idea was erroneous. It substituted for certain declarations which Catholics could not take certain declarations which they could take, and it left certain offices where they were before the Act.

In 1858 the oaths of Allegiance, Abjuration, and Supremacy were consolidated into the following form by 21 & 22 Vict., c. 48, which was "An Act to substitute One Oath for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy & Abjuration, and for the Relief of Her Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish Religion":

I, A.B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and will defend Her to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and Attempts whatever which shall be made against Her Person, Crown, or Dignity and I will do my utmost Endeavour to disclose and make known to Her Majesty, Her Heirs and Successors, all Treasons and Traitorous Conspiracies which may be formed against Her or them, and I do faithfully promise to maintain support and defend to the utmost of my Power, the Succession of the Crown, which succession, by an Act intituled "An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject" is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and the Heirs of Her Body being Protestants, hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or Allegiance unto any other Person claiming or pretending a Right to the Crown of this Realm, and I do declare that no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate hath or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual within this Realm; And I make this Declaration upon the true Faith of a Christian. So help me God.

Section 6 of this Act provided that "nothing in this Act contained shall be held to alter or affect the Provisions of an Act passed in the Tenth Year of King George IV, ch. 7, 'for the relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects'" (i.e. the Roman Catholic Relief Act, 1829). It will be remarked that the above oath did not in any case assist Catholics, since it declared—like its predecessors—that no foreign prince or prelate had or ought to

have any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within the realm.

Following this came the Statute Law Revision Act, 1863, which was "An Act for promoting the Revision of the Statute Law by repealing certain enactments which have ceased to be in force or have become unnecessary". Its preamble reads :

Whereas with a view to the Revision of the Statute Law and particularly to the Preparation of a revised Edition of the Statutes it is expedient that certain Enactments . . . (mentioned in the Schedule to the Act) . . . which have ceased to be in force otherwise than by express and specific Repeal or have, by lapse of Time and Change of Circumstances, become unnecessary, should be expressly and specifically repealed.

The Act goes on to provide that :

The Enactments described in the Schedule are hereby repealed subject to the exception in the Schedule mentioned ; Provided that where any Enactment not comprised in the Schedule has been confirmed, revived or perpetuated by any Enactment hereby repealed, such confirmation, Revivor or Perpetuation shall not be affected by such repeal ; and the repeal by this Act of any Enactment shall not affect any Act in which such enactment has been applied, incorporated or referred to.

Included in the schedule is the Act of 25 Car. II.

The Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, imposed the following uniform oath to be taken by Members of both Houses on taking their seats, and repealed 30 Car. II, st. 2, c. 1, inasmuch as it was not already repealed :

I, A.B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and I do faithfully promise to maintain and support the succession to the Crown, as the same stands limited and settled by virtue of the Act passed in the Reign of King William III. intituled "An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject" and of the subsequent Acts of Union with Scotland and Ireland. So help me God.

The Attorney-General then came to 30 & 31 Vict., c. 62. He declared that "It was upon the construction of

that statute that the question as to the effect of the declaration against transubstantiation on the office of Lord Chancellor of England and Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland must ultimately turn." This Act is entitled "An Act to abolish a certain declaration, commonly called the Declaration against Transubstantiation, the Invocation of Saints, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as practised in the Church of Rome, and to render it unnecessary to take, make, or subscribe the same as a qualification for the exercise or enjoyment of any civil office, franchise, or right". The preamble reads as follows :

Whereas by various Acts a certain Declaration, commonly called the Declaration against Transubstantiation and the Invocation of Saints and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as practised in the Church of Rome, and which Declaration is more fully set forth in the Schedule to this Act annexed is required to be taken, made and subscribed by the Subjects of Her Majesty for the enjoyment of certain civil offices, Franchises and Rights. And whereas it is expedient to alter the Law in that respect and to abolish the said Declaration.

The following is the wording of the two sections of the Act :

(1) From and after the passing of this Act all such parts of the said Acts as require the said Declaration to be taken, made, or subscribed by any of Her Majesty's subjects as a qualification for the exercise or enjoyment of any civil office, franchise, or right, shall be, and the same are, hereby repealed, and it shall not be obligatory for any person to take, make or subscribe the said declaration as a qualification for the exercise or enjoyment of any civil office, right, or franchise within the realm.

(2) Nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to enable any person professing the Roman Catholic religion to exercise or enjoy any civil office, franchise, or right, for the exercise or enjoyment of which, making, taking, or subscribing the declaration by this Act abolished, is now by law a necessary qualification, or any other civil office, franchise, or right from which he is now by law excluded.

Upon the effect of this Act the Attorney-General commented thus : "The statute absolutely abolished the declaration, and repealed all Acts requiring it to be taken

as a qualification for office by all persons whatsoever, but then the second section declared that nothing in the Act should be construed as enabling persons professing the Roman Catholic religion to hold any civil offices other than those they were at that time entitled to hold. The question was whether the statutes imposing the declaration and oaths were abolished against all persons but Roman Catholics. By a subsequent statute all restrictions were abolished, and therefore Roman Catholics would by the effect of that statute be eligible to hold office ; but if the true construction were that the old statutes were absolutely repealed, and that the effect of the second section was to re-enact them *de novo* as regarded Roman Catholics only, then the Parliamentary disability of Roman Catholics still remained" (because this Act has not been repealed). "His opinion was that the former construction was the true one, and that the statutes were not repealed" (by this particular Act) "as against Roman Catholics".

In support of the Attorney-General's view, Mr. Lilly and Mr. Wallis made four points :

(1) For many years after the passing of the Emancipation Act, the Declaration against Transubstantiation was administered to all holders of the offices of Lord Chancellor and Lord-Lieutenant. Complaint was frequently made that the terms of the Declaration were offensive to the feelings of Catholics, whose duty obliged them to assist at such ceremonies as the swearing-in of the Lord-Lieutenant. It was to remove this grievance that this last-named Act was passed in 1867, to relieve Protestant holders of the offices from the necessity of making the Declaration, whilst leaving it to operate as a barrier of exclusion against Catholics. The Attorney-General's view of the proper construction of the statute is the one which best gives effect to the intention of the Legislature in dealing with the complaint, viz. to repeal an unnecessary and offensive ceremony, but to leave Catholics in precisely the same position as they occupied before.

(2) To hold that section 1 repealed the old statutes absolutely, and that section 2 went on to re-enact them

against Catholics, ignores the plain fact that this Act is not a disabling Act but a relieving Act. It does not purport to impose any new disability on Catholics, or to enact anything against them as such, and no such disability can be implied, but must be enacted clearly and expressly.

(3) Section 1 does, indeed, purport to repeal all parts of Acts imposing the Declaration, but, by a well-known rule of construction, the whole Act must be read together; and therefore section 1 must be read subject to the proviso in section 2. Effect is best given to section 2 by interpreting it as having left the old statutes in force against Catholics and not as itself re-enacting them.

(4) If the Act is imposing the Declarations afresh, and not merely leaving them to draw their life from the old statutes, we should expect to find provisions as to tendering those Declarations to Catholics appointed to the offices. But it does not do so, and, if the Attorney-General's view is wrong, the position arises that Parliament enacted that Catholics must make a Declaration but did not (save indirectly and by reference) state what the terms of the Declaration were to be.

The next stage is reached with the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, which, said Sir John Coleridge, "substituted a further oath" (as distinct from a Declaration) "but one that the Roman Catholics could take, and by the ninth section the Lord Chancellor was specially referred to as a person who could take the oath. The old oaths were gone, a substituted oath was enacted on all classes and individuals, and if a Roman Catholic could take the new oath he could become the Lord Chancellor". This Act, then, provided an Oath of Allegiance and a Judicial Oath which was to be taken by (amongst others) the Lord Chancellor. The former was as follows:

I — do swear that I will be faithful and bear True allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Her Heirs and Successors according to Law. So help me God.

The latter ran thus:

I — do swear that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria in the Office of —, and I will do right to all manner of people after the Laws and Usages of this Realm, without Fear or Favour, Affection or Illwill. So help me God.

Section 8 provided that :

The form of the Oath of Allegiance provided by this Act shall be deemed to be substituted . . . in the case of the Parliamentary Oaths Act 1866 for the form of Oath thereby prescribed and in the case of the Offices and Oath Act 1867 for the form of the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy and Abjuration therein referred to. . . .

(The Offices and Oath Act, 1867, affected Protestants only.)

The Attorney-General pointed out, however, that even after this last Act, the statutes 1 Geo. I and 9 Geo. II (quoted above) remained alive until the Promissory Oaths Act, 1871, which was "An Act to repeal divers Enactments relating to Oaths and Declarations which are not in force, and for other purposes connected therewith". The preamble of this Act ran as follows :

Whereas divers Acts and parts of Acts relating to Oaths and Declarations have been virtually repealed by divers recent Acts and in particular by an Act of the Session of the 29th and 30th years of the reign of Her Present Majesty, Chapter 22 intituled "An Act to render it unnecessary to take and subscribe certain declarations as a qualification for offices and employments, to indemnify such persons as have omitted to qualify themselves for office and employment, and for other purposes relating thereto" and by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, and it is expedient with a view to the revision of the statute law, and particularly to the preparation of the revised edition of the statutes now in progress, expressly to repeal the Acts and parts of Acts so virtually repealed and other parts of the same Acts which have ceased to be in force.

The Act then went on to repeal the statutes 1 Geo. I and 9 Geo. II. Accordingly, in the Attorney-General's view, "the effect of all this, to the best of his judgment, was, that the restrictions having been kept alive up to that time, these two Acts" (the two Georgian Acts) "undoubtedly operated to exclude Roman Catholics. When these Acts were abolished without restriction" (by

the Promissory Oaths Act, 1871) "the restriction against Roman Catholics went with them, and no longer existed".

The authority for claiming the weight of Lord Haldane's approval of the above conclusion is to be found in his *Autobiography* at page 67 et seq. :

Among the many cases which were laid before me for opinion at this time [some forty years ago], I remember one which consisted of a blank sheet with a substantial fee and the names of three other well-known Counsel, junior to myself, who were to advise with me. The questions were two :—

- (1) Could a Roman Catholic be Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and
- (2) Could a Roman Catholic be Lord Chancellor of Great Britain ?

. . . I gave an opinion, in which my fellow-counsel concurred, that a Roman Catholic could, on the true construction of the statutes, hold the office [of Lord Chancellor]. I afterwards discovered that the real client who had taken my opinion was Lord Russell of Killowen, then Lord Chief Justice of England.

(The Lord Russell of Killowen referred to was the father of the present Lord.)

Many Catholics were—and are still—misled by the categorical assertions by the late Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords debate on the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, 1926. His Grace spoke as follows :

" . . . I feel bound at the same time to emphasize that there still remain what the noble lord himself [Lord FitzAlan], I think, alluded to and what can rightly and truly be called disabilities of a certain sort. The foremost instance is, of course, the Act of Succession. Nobody has ever whispered any desire to change its provisions. A Roman Catholic cannot sit upon the Woolsack. The Woolsack has great duties to discharge towards the Church, as well as the State and the Law Courts, and, in ancient phrase, he is the keeper of the King's Conscience. We enact at present that the office cannot be held by a member of the Roman Catholic Church. Again, I think it is indisputably right that one who is a Roman Catholic and holds what we call the patronage of livings in the Church of England should be bound to leave to others actually as well as nominally the decision about each appointment.

"If it be asked why we need retain these disabilities at all and why we should not make a clean sweep of the whole thing, as one or two people have suggested in the course of these debates, the answer lies in the history of England. The last thing I wish to say is a single unkind or discourteous word, but we cannot obliterate from our history, or from memory, occasions when what I would venture to call the spirit of the Papacy has threatened our liberties. Further, it must be said that even in the present attitude of that great communion there is sometimes evidence of the persistence on the part of its ecclesiastical chiefs of a spirit or a system which is out of touch with our normal and characteristic English spirit in Church and State. While that system persists the reason for retaining some safeguards is not so far to find. Happily in the Bill before us the abolition of these restrictions is not even suggested."

It is not difficult to criticize the foregoing remarks. In the statement "we enact at present that the office" (of Lord Chancellor) "cannot be held by a member of the Roman Catholic Church" the phrase "we enact" obviously cannot mean "we are now about to enact in this Bill of 1926" because the Act of 1926 does not in any way remotely bear upon the question of the Chancellorship. By "we enact at present" presumably the Archbishop meant "in the present state of the enactments now in force it is provided". That assertion and the further statement that "a Roman Catholic cannot sit upon the Woolsack" were not made by a lawyer, and as an exposition of the law cannot stand in face of the considered opinions of the distinguished legal authorities whose arguments and conclusions are set forth above. His Grace was misinformed.

That it would be odd to have a Catholic appointing Anglican vicars would, perhaps, not be more odd than to have a Baptist, Parsee, or Atheist appointing Anglican bishops, as the law now allows and the Church of England tolerates. In any case, its oddness does not affect the question of its legality, nor is it impossible to provide that some other great officer of State should act in the matter for the Lord Chancellor when the latter happens

to be a Catholic, as was, indeed, provided in the cases of the Lord Chancellor and Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

The question of the Act of Succession was raised in the Act of 1926 no more than the question of the Chancellorship; the Act dealt with, and referred to, neither the one nor the other. But since the Archbishop mentioned it, we may perhaps be permitted to observe that in these enlightened days it is strange that the King of England should not have the liberty in religion that every one of his subjects has, including his Cabinet Ministers, the members of both Houses of his Parliament, the heads and every member of his armed forces, civil service, and police. Whatever their religion may be, the King is not free to follow the religion that his predecessors followed for more than a thousand years, and that seventeen millions of his subjects follow today in common with what, as a mere matter of statistics, is the clear majority of the Christian world. The King is today the last victim of the Penal Laws. That restriction may seem to Anglicans, in the words of their Archbishop, to provide "some safeguards". We venture to commend to their consideration the difficulties of Dame Partington, so admirably described by the Rev. Sydney Smith in 1831, in an address to some supporters of reform :

I do not mean to be disrespectful, but the attempt of the Lords to stop the progress of reform, reminds me very forcibly of the great storm at Sidmouth, and of the conduct of the excellent Mr. Partington on that occasion. In the winter of 1824, there set in a great flood upon that town—the tide rose to an incredible height—the waves rushed in upon the houses, and everything was threatened with destruction. In the midst of this sublime and terrible storm, Dame Partington who lived upon the beach, was seen at the door of her house with mop and pattens, trundling her mop, squeezing out the sea water, and vigorously pushing away the Atlantic Ocean. The Atlantic was roused. Mrs. Partington's spirit was up; but I need not tell you that the contest was unequal. The Atlantic Ocean beat Mrs. Partington. She was excellent at a slop, or a puddle, but she should not have meddled with a tempest. Gentlemen, be at your ease—be quiet and steady, you will beat Mrs. Partington.

RALPH V. CUSACK.
DEREK HARBORD.

MODERN CATHOLIC ARCHITECTURE IN SCOTLAND

THE building of Catholic churches in Scotland came to an abrupt end with the overthrow of the Faith and the establishment of Presbyterianism in 1560. The old churches were either destroyed or adapted for the worship of the new religion, for which they were particularly unsuitable.

As to the loyal remnant of Scottish Catholics—they worshipped for close on two centuries, when they dared risk fines, imprisonment, and banishment, either in barns, lofts, private houses, or in the open air. Only in some of the mansions or castles of the nobility were permanent chapels to be found during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, e.g. Stobhall, Traquair, Terregles, Fetternear, Kirkconnell, Gordon Castle, Huntly Castle, etc. Stobhall deserves special mention. Formerly the seat of the Drummond family, situated a few miles north of Perth, it still contains the chapel, with stone altar, aumbry, and holy-water stoup, built about 1578. It was probably the last place of Catholic worship which was definitely built for this purpose until the erection of the church at Preshome in 1788—or, to be more exact, the only place where any attempt was made to introduce architectural features, or to provide a permanent stone altar. In the other chapels, the fittings were merely of a temporary nature.

The Chapel Royal at Holyrood falls into a different category. Here the nave of the old pre-Reformation chapel was rebuilt and redecorated with lavish expense by James VII, but was in use for little more than a year. On the accession of William of Orange to the throne of England the chapel was sacked by a mob, and most of its contents burnt or destroyed. The oldest post-Reformation church in Scotland in which Mass is still said would appear to be St. Ninian's, Tynet, not far from Fochabers in Morayshire. This long, low building might easily be passed by, under the impression that it was a barn or cow-byre. In fact it was originally built

as a sheep-cote about 1754, then adapted as a church. It was enlarged to its present size in 1787. St. Ninian's is about the only surviving example left to us of many other similar barnlike "Popish Mass houses" erected in the eighteenth century, particularly in the North and in the West Highlands.* A few still remain in the Outer Hebrides, but most of them have now been rebuilt. At Tynet the altar and other interior fittings are very simple and primitive. There is an old pulpit with sounding-board, also a gilt dove suspended above the altar, said to have been brought here from the chapel, now destroyed, which formerly stood in the graveyard about a mile from the church. Here Bishop Nicholson, the first Vicar Apostolic in Scotland, and many other missionaries were buried.

Within a couple of miles of Tynet, near the hamlet of Clochan, in the heart of the Enzie District, where the Old Religion managed to survive right through the Penal Times, stands St. Gregory's, Preshome. It was the first attempt to build a Catholic church to *look like a church* after the Reformation, and it dates from 1788. At the time many people thought it was a rash venture and would only result in a renewed outburst of persecution. The west front, with its rounded pediment, large circular-headed windows, and parapets adorned with Grecian urns, still remains in much the same state as when it was erected nearly a hundred and fifty years ago. Over the door is a tablet bearing the curious inscription "DEO 1788". As many visitors have remarked, it is not often that you find a church dedicated to Almighty God in this uncompromising manner. Unfortunately the interior has been much spoilt by the addition of a Gothic sanctuary, and an extremely ornate High Altar, designed by Peter Paul Pugin. These additions are entirely out of keeping with the rest of the building.

* See "The Story of St. Ninian's" by the Rev. William Watson in *Scottish Catholic Directory* (1936). This historic building is now in a dangerous condition, and the roof has been shored up. It is proposed to replace it by a modern church as the opinion has been given that further repair is impossible.

"Popish chapels" were also built during the latter half of the eighteenth century in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, and Glasgow. But they were little more than bare rooms, carefully planned so that the exterior should not betray their real character. St. Peter's, Aberdeen, still in use, although enlarged at a later date, was built in 1803. This venerable shrine still retains much of its original "atmosphere" and takes one back into the Penal Times. It is approached through a narrow archway from Justice Street, which opens out into a small paved courtyard. A stranger would never suspect the presence of a Catholic church. One of the most interesting things about St. Peter's is the timid effort on the part of the architect to introduce Gothic details after the "Strawberry Hill" manner. This is probably the earliest instance of the Gothic Revival in any Catholic church in Scotland.

The sudden increase in the congregations of Glasgow and other towns in the neighbourhood, as the result of the immigration of poor Irish labourers early in the nineteenth century, made it necessary to provide for their spiritual welfare. St. Mirin's, Paisley, was the first example of a large church definitely built for the Irish immigrants. So numerous had they become that nothing less than seating accommodation of 1000 was considered advisable. This church was in use until a few years ago, when it was replaced by a modern building. An even more ambitious effort is to be found in St. Andrew's, Glasgow, which took the place of the old Calton Chapel, now pulled down. Here accommodation was provided for between 2000 and 3000. At the time of its erection, St. Andrew's was the largest Catholic church in Great Britain. It was opened in 1816, and while the walls were rising, gangs of Protestants used to come at night and pull down the work which had been put up the day before. The style of architecture is English Perpendicular Gothic, vaguely reminiscent of King's College, Cambridge, as were so many churches built about this time, e.g. the church at Stonyhurst College (1832). The plan consists of nave, aisles, and shallow apsidal sanctuary. The carving on the capitals of the nave columns is delightfully unsophisticated, revealing a

refreshing ignorance of traditional Gothic ornament. You feel it must have been worked out by the carver himself, to please his own fancy. The spacious galleries were removed about 1890 when the firm of Pugin and Pugin were called in to make the building more worthy of its cathedral status. The altars are also from their designs. One is thankful that they did not completely ruin the charm of this interesting example of the early phase of the Gothic Revival. Fortunately the smoke-blackened exterior still remains unaltered.

St. Mary's, Edinburgh, now the cathedral of the archdiocese, is almost contemporary with St. Andrew's, Glasgow. Both were designed by a Protestant architect, J. Gillespie Graham. The exterior of the two churches is practically identical. St. Mary's was built in 1814. A contemporary writer informs us that it is an example of the "purest Gothic, with pinnacles according to the antique, which produce a fine effect to those who admire the style adopted". The interior has been entirely rebuilt at subsequent dates, and retains little or nothing of its original form. An apsidal chancel was added in 1896. The Gothic baldachino, designed by Reginald Fairlie, R.S.A., is a striking feature. The roof has been raised and decorations carried out by Messrs. Reid and Forbes. From the expressions on their faces it would seem that the brightly coloured wooden angels who support the roof trusses do not appreciate Monsieur Bayaert's rival celestial host more recently depicted above the chancel arch. Other interesting Gothic churches of the same type, and built about the same period include St. Margaret's, Ayr (1827), old St. Patrick's, Dumbarton, now disused (1830), New Abbey, Kirkcudbrightshire (1824), and St. Andrew's, Dundee (1836).

But it was in the Northern Vicariate that church-building was carried on much more than in any other part of Scotland between 1820 and 1840. In the counties of Aberdeen and Banff, also in certain parts of Inverness-shire, there existed large and fairly prosperous congregations. Once it became possible to come out into the open with no fear of molestation, there started almost

a mania of church-building. The year of Catholic Emancipation saw the opening of Gothic churches at Portsoy, Tombae, and Chapelstown—the last two in Glenlivet. Three years before, another Gothic church had been built at Fochabers, Morayshire. Inverness and Tomintoul followed in 1837, Braemar in 1839, Elgin in 1844. In their main features and plan all these churches are much alike, and show no desire to break away from what had almost become a standardized formula. Tomintoul is the only exception. Here the architect experimented with a Greek-cross plan—putting the presbytery in one of the arms of the cross, so the church is in the shape of a T.

Looking back today after more than a century one would like to know why the architects* of these churches were so attached to the English Perpendicular style of Gothic, and why they did not resort to a native expression of mediaeval architecture. The glories of Scottish work appear to have left them cold. And yet what is so interesting is the fact that, almost in spite of themselves, they produced churches which express in stone or granite something of the sternness of the Scottish character. Superficially these buildings have little to distinguish them from contemporary work in England, yet somehow or other they are different, maybe due to the free hand given to the masons to build in their accustomed manner.

In some of them, e.g. Portsoy and Tombae, you feel that a local mason might have designed them. The curious pinnacles at Portsoy and the almost "Classic" mouldings which cut across the pilasters were certainly not copied from the architectural treatises of Britton or the elder Pugin. But how perfectly satisfactory they are, and how surprisingly original! At Inverness, more elaborate than some of the earlier churches, there is some very curious stone carving on the façade, and some most unexpected, almost Flamboyant, tracery, put in above a sort of screen which finishes off the corners of the exterior.

* Few of their names have been recorded in the descriptions of the churches given in the annual volumes of the *Scottish Catholic Directory*.

Plain, solid little churches, with no fuss or nonsense about them—a material expression in stone, so one might say, of that sturdy deep-rooted Faith which had managed to survive in the North during the Penal Times; they are perfectly in keeping with that solid piety which one finds in the writings of Bishop Hay. Few people can appreciate Bishop Hay in these days; he belongs to a different epoch. For similar reasons, few people seem to appreciate these churches, which were built by the men who had been brought up in that austere form of Catholicism. St. Mary's, Dufftown, must not be forgotten. Exteriorly it is akin to all the others just mentioned, but here, as in St. Andrew's, Glasgow, there is an experiment with plaster rib-vaulting on the ceiling. Until the chancel was enlarged in 1925 this church possessed a delightful baldachino—Gothic with a suggestion of Moorish—but it has now been removed.

In the West Highlands and Outer Isles, Catholics were too poor to indulge in much church-building, and in most places, long after the Emancipation Act had been passed in 1829, they continued to worship in what were little better than barns or cow-byres. However, there are exceptions here and there, e.g. the little Gothic church at Glencoe (1836), the chapel at Drimnin, Morven (1838). At Eskdale, near Beaully, Inverness-shire, an interesting church was built by Lord Lovat in 1826. The nave is separated from the aisles by massive Norman columns. The low-pitched roof covers the entire building, and gives the exterior a very squat effect. Eskdale still retains its primitive low-backed benches; more conducive to penance than to comfort. But they are not nearly so primitive as the narrow forms in the chapel at Kirkconnell, Kirkcudbrightshire, built in 1823, the interior of which is in almost exactly the same condition as when it was erected; a perfect example of the "Popish Mass house" of Penal Times.

Not all the churches erected between 1820 and 1840 were Gothic in style. St. Thomas's, Keith, is an example of Roman Doric, and was opened in 1831. It is said to be a copy of S. Maria degli Angeli in Rome, at least the façade. St. Margaret's, Huntly, dates from 1834, and

has an almost circular plan, together with a classic façade and stately campanile of original design. Incidentally it was the first Catholic church in Scotland to be given a bell since the Reformation. St. Andrew's, Dumfries, which goes back to 1813, was originally a "large and commodious chapel in the Grecian style", but it has since been altered beyond all recognition. After 1840 church-building was carried on much more in the industrial districts of the Lowlands, especially in and around Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Dundee, than in the country districts of the north. Catholicism was spreading everywhere owing to the influx of Irish, and the numerous churches that were erected between 1840 and 1880—one might also say until the close of the century—were for the benefit of these Irish immigrants and their descendants, although to a certain extent there was a much more limited migration of Catholics from the Highlands to the same industrial centres. In Glasgow there arose the large Classic church of St. Mary, Abercromby Street (1842), which holds about 1800. St. Joseph's, North Woodside Road (1850), is another large church in the same Classic style. Pollockshaws, Maryhill, and old St. Patrick's were erected in Gothic, also Hamilton and Airdrie—all about the same period.*

It is important to remember that there was practically nothing in Scotland to correspond with the Oxford Movement, to give encouragement to a revival of Christian architecture as in England. Augustus Welby Pugin, as Shane Leslie has written, "insanely inspired, making the House of God more beautiful and ornate than the English thought proper, and crying aloud: 'Make Gothic the paths of the Lord, and with Pointed Architecture prepare the road of His Coming'", seldom came to Scotland. So there was no controversy over rood screens, liturgical music, or the shape of vestments. The masses of Haydn and Mozart, accompanied by full orchestras and with the extra attraction of professional soloists,

* St. Joachim's, Wick (Caithness), possesses a special interest, having been built in 1837 to accommodate the crowds of fish-workers, mostly Irish, who gathered in the town during the season. It is a great barnlike structure.

received no episcopal condemnation in Scotland until a much later date. In fact the Vicars Apostolic seem to have encouraged them. The only mention I have come across anywhere in Scotland of a rood screen in a Catholic church is at Inverurie, where in 1852 the priest announced that he was going to build a "parish church as in the Goode Olde Tymes" and said that a "rood loft would not be forgotten".

Bishop Gillis hoped to build a large Gothic cathedral and adjoining college in Edinburgh, and got Pugin to draw the plans, which were exhibited in 1850. But unfortunately they were never carried out, and Scotland is the poorer. Pugin had a lifelong friend in the Scottish architect Gillespie Graham, already mentioned, who among other churches, mostly Episcopalian or Presbyterian, built the stately chapel at Murthly Castle, Perthshire, for Sir William Drummond-Stewart in 1846, no longer used for Catholic worship. He also designed the chapel at St. Margaret's Convent, Edinburgh (1835)—the first religious community to be established in Scotland since the Reformation.* Edward Pugin was responsible for one or two churches in Scotland. In collaboration with Joseph Hansom he designed that of Our Lady of the Sea, Leith, a good example of Early English Gothic, the first part of which was opened in 1854. Twenty years later he built the pretty little church at Glenfinnan, Inverness-shire. Joseph Hansom is represented in Scotland by several churches, including Dalkeith (1854), built by the Marchioness of Lothian, and Dornie, on the west coast of Inverness-shire, built by the Duchess of Leeds in 1860. He also designed the college buildings at Fort Augustus (1878). Another English architect of the Gothic Revival was William Wardell—best known by the Catholic Cathedral at Sydney, N.S.W. One finds an example of his work in the Early English Gothic church at Kelso, where he was employed by Mr. Hope Scott of Abbotsford in 1858. William Ellis, an Aberdeen architect, built several

* It was Gillespie Graham who "rescued" the young Pugin after he landed at Leith in 1830, having been wrecked at sea. He presented him with a set of pocket compasses which Pugin always carried about with him for the rest of his life.

Catholic churches in the North. They include St. Peter's, Buckie (1857), St. Mary's Cathedral, Aberdeen (1860), and Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Banff (1870). In plan the two former buildings are almost identical. The architectural details of the interiors possess a certain "primitive" quality which is not without interest.

There are several instances of Episcopalian churches being bought and adapted for Catholic worship. The best known of these is St. Patrick's, Edinburgh, a large Classic building, reopened in 1856; also old St. Alphonsus', Glasgow, as well as Brechin. Peter Paul Pugin—the younger son of Augustus Welby Pugin—seems to have been given his first important work in Scotland by the monks of Fort Augustus, for whom he designed their monastery and cloisters in 1878, as well as preparing plans for an elaborate Gothic church, of which the foundations were begun in 1889, but of which only two chapels were ever completed. The monastic buildings are typical of the architect; designed, so one imagines, with little or no reference to either the nature of the site or the climate of the district. They are extremely elaborate, and no better description of their style can be found than "Over-Decorated Gothic". They belong to the age of bustles and chignons in female fashions, with which they have much in common. St. Francis', Cumberland Street, Glasgow, built for the Friars Minor, must have been his next big job. This vast church, seating about 1700, was begun in 1882 and completed in 1896. The scale on which it is planned certainly gives it a very definite grandeur, emphasized all the more by the contrast of its squalid and sordid surroundings.

St. Margaret's, Kinning Park, Glasgow, followed soon after St. Francis'; and, with the encouragement and recommendation of Archbishop Eyre, Pugin's success was assured. For to all intents and purposes he became the official architect of the archdiocese. Even Sir Christopher Wren after the Great Fire cannot have built more churches in London than did the firm of Pugin and Pugin in and around Glasgow during the two last decades of the nineteenth century. One can recognize their churches long before one gets up to them; they are quite

unmistakable. All possess a family likeness, no matter where they are situated. Quite two-thirds of them are designed in what is known as the "English Decorated style of Gothic", and the invariable material, with few exceptions, is a warm red sandstone, usually with a hammer-dressed surface. The planning is generally carefully thought out and practical. Peter Paul Pugin knew just what his clients required, and they got what they wanted for their money—a useful, well-built church, suitable for the needs of a modern congregation. I have sometimes heard these churches described as "chaste"—whatever this may signify. Huysmans would probably dismiss them as "*Bon Dieuserie*". The interiors have all got certain uniform features. There are the varnished pitch-pine benches; the same material being generally used in the roof. There is generally a communion rail of either polished brass or marble. The altars are invariably constructed of Caen stone or polished marble,* ornamented with a profusion of columns, tracery, crockets, and pinnacles, not to mention adoring angels and several rows of gradines. The jewel-encrusted brass tabernacle doors are enclosed with stone or marble. More often than not, there rises up an elaborate throne with more angels; the whole wedding-cake-like erection being surmounted by a crocketed spire. The altar itself is almost lost amid such a wealth of decoration, and is the least-important feature of this ornate "side board"; conceived rather as a fitting background for Solemn Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, than for the Sacrifice of the Mass. Stained glass, more than likely by Hardman of Birmingham, fills most of the windows. There are large roomy sacristies—an important feature of a Catholic church so often forgotten by architects, but never by Peter Paul Pugin—and, equally important, a comfortable presbytery, usually linked up to the church by a covered-in passage or cloister in which the priests can say their office while walking up and down. There is nothing cheap or shoddy about these churches, whatever other criticisms

* Including a certain very popular brand which inevitably suggests tinned brawn.

modern architects may make. They are the material expression of the latter-nineteenth-century Scoto-Irish Catholicism. They record the spirit of the age in which they were erected, and for this reason alone Peter Paul Pugin's work will have a permanent interest for future historians of nineteenth-century architecture.*

A much greater architect was William Burgess, who designed so many fine Gothic churches in England, and whose work is strongly influenced by French churches of the thirteenth century. He is represented in Scotland by St. John's, Old Cumnock, erected at the expense of the late Marquis of Bute in 1882.

George Goldie was another English architect who fell under the spell of French Gothic of an early period, but who in his latter years abandoned it for the fifteenth-century Perpendicular style. One finds churches by him in Scotland at Galashiels (1858), Lanark (1859; destroyed by fire in 1910 and rebuilt by Ashlin and Coleman, of Dublin), Girvan (1862), Wishaw (1865), St. Mary's, Greenock (1862), West Calder (1877), and St. Mungo's, Glasgow (1869), perhaps his finest work in Scotland. Dunn and Hansom were employed at North Berwick (1879) and at Dumbarton (1903);† neither of these is a very inspiring church.

At North Berwick there is a chancel designed by Basil Champneys and a Lady chapel added by Sir Robert Lorimer—the most famous Scottish architect of modern times. Although not a Catholic, it was Lorimer who was selected by the late Canon John Gray, when he started

* The following are among the best-known churches in Scotland designed by Peter Paul Pugin (or his firm, Pugin and Pugin) in addition to those already mentioned: Linlithgow (1888); Stirling (1905); St. John's, Portugal Street, Glasgow (1897); St. Alphonsus, Glasgow (1905); St. Patrick's, Glasgow (1897); St. Peter's, Partick (1903); Holy Cross, Glasgow (1911); Lambhill (1893); Baillieston (1893); Blantyre (1905); Motherwell (1900); Shieldmuir (1898); Carfin (1882); Mossend (1884); Airdrie (1896); Shotts (1905); Wemyss Bay (1901); Clydebank (1903); Kirkintilloch (1893); St. Lawrence's, Greenock (1905); St. Mary's, Paisley (1892); Johnstone (1882); St. Patrick's, Dundee (1898); St. Peter's College, Bearsden (1892); Convent of the F.C.J., Paisley (1889); Benedictine Convent, Dumfries (1884).

† The new chancel and High Altar were added by Pugin and Pugin (1936). They must be about the last word in "Gothic Revival". Maybe future connoisseurs will regard this work with the same enthusiastic appreciation as is now given to the later examples of German Rococo. There is a stone-carved St. Michael by Eric Gill in this church.

to build the new church of St. Peter, Morningside, Edinburgh, in 1906. A born artist himself, Canon Gray knew instinctively who could design the ideal church for him. The result has been often said to represent the summit of Lorimer's achievement. The beauty of this church may be said to lie in its extreme simplicity. All the devices the architect could summon were used to give the impression of size and height. It is in no particular style, but vaguely suggestive of an Early Christian basilica. The Renaissance High Altar and reredos are of pale green marble, and are surmounted by a large painting by Frank Brangwyn, R.A. Another painting of St. Michael, by Glyn Philpott, R.A., hangs on the west wall of the church. The stations of the Cross were painted by John Duncan, R.S.A. In St. Peter's, Edinburgh, Scottish Catholics have at least one church which can compare favourably with any other modern church in Great Britain, if not in Europe.

A Catholic architect who built some interesting churches in Scotland was Archibald Macpherson, who sometimes showed signs of real genius in his otherwise uneven work. One finds churches designed by him at Ballater (1905), Musselburgh (1905), Chapelton, Glenlivet (1897), Bannockburn (1925), and elsewhere. All of them are marked by a definitely "Scottish" character. While employing traditional forms, Macpherson used them without slavish copying. When the star of Peter Paul Pugin was beginning to wane, there was a Belgian architect—Charles Ménart—who enjoyed a brief popularity in Scotland and left his mark with several striking churches. Ménart possessed a remarkable versatility, and was prepared to design a church in almost any known style of architecture. There is his towering reredos of stone and marble at Buckie (1907)—aggressively Gothic, with its forest of pinnacles and crockets. Three years later arose in Glasgow the large Italian Renaissance church of St. Aloysius, Garnet Hill, almost simultaneously with the Early Christian Basilica of the Sacred Heart, Bridgeton. No two churches could be more unlike each other. The former just falls short of being a really fine building; indeed there is very little wrong with its red

sandstone exterior and lofty campanile. The interior might have been a thing of joy, but within the last few years it has been spoilt by the addition of decorations not according to Ménart's design. However, some of the side chapels have been completed according to the architect's ideas, and the Bute chapel is a fine example of Baroque. At Bridgeton, the wide nave, separated from the narrow aisles by marble columns, could hardly be improved on. It was a bold decision to include the Gothic High Altar from the old church, but the effect is quite good—just the sort of thing you might find in a similar church in Italy.

The Sacred Heart, Torry, Aberdeen, is a mixture of Byzantine and Romanesque, the plan being in the shape of a Greek cross. So far the interior has been left bare of any attempt at decoration, except for the baldachino (a copy of the one in S. Clemente in Rome). One can only hope that this church will be spared the fate of St. Aloysius, Garnet Hill. Ménart in his church at Helensburgh went off to English Perpendicular Gothic for inspiration, while at Keith he got another chance to make use of Italian Renaissance; adding transepts and a dome to the existing church built about ninety years earlier. Quite different again is the War Memorial chapel at St. Joseph's College, Dumfries. Here the architect has tried to mingle both Byzantine and Saracenic details. This is the last church he designed in Scotland, so far as I know.*

In the heart of industrial Ayrshire you will come across an exotic-looking church which seems to have strayed there from the Near East—Santa Sophia, Galston. It was built in 1886 at the entire cost of the late Marquis of Bute. It must be one of the first Byzantine churches in Great Britain. Lord Bute intended that the interior should be covered with mosaic decorations, but these have never been carried out, and the church remains in much the same condition as when it was opened fifty years ago. Two brick churches of original design are to

* Ménart was also responsible for the elaborate decoration of the new Gothic chapel at Blairs College; designed by Curran, the Irish architect.

be found in the neighbouring villages of Gretna and Eastriggs, both designed in the Lombardic style by C. A. Simmons during the Great War.

The beautiful domestic chapel of Keir House, near Dunblane, in the Byzantine style with its mosaics by Boris Anrep and chaste blending of rare marbles, is a fitting memorial to the fine artistic taste of its builder—the late Brigadier-General Archibald Stirling of Keir. Another little chapel which must not be forgotten is St. Margaret's Oratory at Comrie, Perthshire; a perfect "gem" of Italian Baroque, erected by the Rev. Charles D. Williamson of Tomperran. Sir John Burnet's Romanesque church at Kingussie (1932) has received high praise in certain quarters. Another Romanesque church is to be found at Dunfermline, designed by Sir Rowand Anderson in 1896, but never completed according to the original plans, which were on an ambitious scale. The late John Devlin showed signs of promise in some of his work, notably the little church at Banchory (1932), but most of it is in the nature of additions and alterations to existing churches, e.g. Dufftown. St. John's, Portobello, designed by J. T. Walford in 1896, is a curious structure in what might be described as "Art Nouveau Gothic". Its tower is unlike anything that I have ever seen, and certainly "striking".

So far as I know, there has been no attempt to build a purely "functional" church in Scotland on the lines of those now so common in Germany, France, Holland, and other Continental countries. Such experiments have been confined to cinemas and shops, and of these there are but few and not very inspiring examples. In recent years Sir Giles Gilbert Scott, R.A., has designed two Catholic churches in Scotland: St. Ninian's, Restalrig, Edinburgh, and St. Columba's Cathedral, Oban. Neither of them is so far completed, but even in their unfinished state both these churches are very striking and original. In each of them the architect has made use of traditional Scottish Gothic details, without any attempt at slavish imitation. From the constructional point of view both present interesting features. Oban Cathedral is built of red and grey granite, and gives the impression

of extreme solidity and strength, combined with simplicity.

The only Scottish architect, however, whose name is likely to live in years to come in connexion with Catholic churches is Reginald Fairlie, R.S.A. Since he first showed proof of unusual talent with the erection of the Catholic church at St. Andrews in 1910, he has gone on from strength to strength, culminating with his superb chapel for the Sacred Heart nuns at Craiglockhart (1935). In some of his earlier churches, e.g. Troon (1911), he tried to re-create the more elaborate features of the later development of Scottish Gothic, but in all his later work, possibly due to the need for a rigid economy, he has evolved a much more simple style, which is entirely personal and at the same time quite definitely "national", reminding one in some respects of some of the modern architects of Sweden, e.g. Sigrid Ericson, Ivar Tengbom, O. L. Hökerberg, or Carl Westman.

His Romanesque designs for the Abbey Church at Fort Augustus have never got beyond the choir (1916). Neither has his beautiful church at Carfin yet been erected. But one finds good examples of Fairlie's work at Rothesay (1925), Roy Bridge (1929), Dunkeld (1932), Fort William (1934), Dunblane (1935), Notre Dame Convent chapel, Dumbarton (1935), Mallaig (1935), also in several of the mining villages of Fife, where he has built a number of small churches at a very low cost, often using concrete or artificial stone with a view to cheapness, and with most satisfactory results. To the professional architect the chief interest in Fairlie's churches lies in his willingness to experiment in modern methods of construction and to use new materials. More often than not his churches are Romanesque in feeling, sometimes with a suggestion of the Scottish Renaissance, or again pure Gothic, as at Dumbarton. At Fort Augustus and Fort William he has designed two different versions of a baldachino; the former in wood, surmounted by a canopy of stamped leather, gilded and coloured; the latter of wrought iron, also decorated with gold and colour. Of Fairlie's purely secular work there is no room to write in this article, but it is quite

up to the high standard of his churches. In the designs for the new National Library in Edinburgh he has further scope for his genius.

Apart from Fairlie the only other Catholic architect of any note in modern Scotland is J. A. Coia, whose churches of St. Anne, Glasgow, and St. Patrick, Greenock, are interesting conceptions of considerable originality.

When one surveys what has been done by Catholics in the way of church-building in Scotland during the past century, one has to confess that, with only a few exceptions, the churches we have erected will not add very much to our credit when studied by future generations. The Catholic Church in modern Scotland, taken as a whole, is a poor and struggling body. With a few rare exceptions all the architects employed during the past century have been aliens from across the Border. For Scottish Catholicism has produced few men of genius or talent, in any of the arts. Its main preoccupation has been to prevent its children from lapsing into Paganism or Protestantism, surrounded as they are on all sides by hostile influences. But up to the present it has made little attempt to impress itself on the consciousness of the nation by the external manifestations of its worship or liturgy—i.e. by Christian art. The cultured Scotsman of today will find little to attract him in our churches. Whatever else may be said against the Catholics of Scotland by their enemies, they cannot be accused of trying to ensnare their fellow countrymen by the "sensuous glamour of Rome". The Protestant Scotsman will look in vain for this "sensuous glamour" in most of our churches, and if he is drawn into the net of Peter the Fisherman it will not be by means of his emotions but through his intellect, or should one say the Grace of God? With the few exceptions already mentioned, it is sad to admit that so far we have contributed little to the advance of artistic production in Scotland during the past hundred years.

PETER F. ANSON.

LAMPS OF FIRE

¡ Oh lámparas de fuego,
En cuyos resplandores
Las profundas cavernas del sentido
Que estaba oscura y ciego,
Con extraños primores
Calor y luz dan junto a su querido !*

IN his preface to the Benedictine (Stanbrook) edition of *The Living Flame*, Cardinal Wiseman reminded readers of it that the writings of St. John of the Cross

are far from being a string of loose, disjointed thoughts, scattered apothegms or aimless rhapsodies. Quite on the contrary, there is even a sequence and strict logical continuity in every direction of his discourse, and all the several parts are coherent and consistent. [P. xiv.]

This collection of extracts from Fray Juan's works, some not very easily accessible, extracts arranged under headings not in the original, and out of their context, is proffered not as a gratuitous folly, but with deliberate intentions. One such is to provide exemplary proof that St. John was not an "inflexible" saint, a repellent man devoid of natural human feeling. This notion has not seldom been offered as an excuse for total refusal even to make an attempt to read him ; an excuse sometimes bolstered up by appeal to a supposed judgement of Joris Karl Huysmans. Only a careless reader of *En Route* can take Durtal's *cet inflexible Saint*, still less the Abbé Gévresin's description :

Il marche droit devant lui, mais souvent on l'aperçoit, au bout de la route, terrible et sanglant, et les yeux secs !

as Huysmans' personal view. Both were intended to prepare for Durtal's later and emphatic avowal in chapter v, ii^{ème} partie :

- * O lamps of fire that shined
With so intense a light,
That those deep caverns where the senses live,
Which were obscure and blind,
Now with strange glories bright
Both heat and light to His beloved give.
[Arthur Symons' translation.]

Je comprends maintenant pourquoi l'abbé Gévresin tenait tant à me prêter Saint Jean de la Croix. . . . Il se rendait compte de la lucidité, de la puissance d'esprit de ce Saint, expliquant la vicissitude la plus obscure, la moins connue de l'âme.

Ascetic, Fray Juan was. Asceticism being bound up with practical Christianity, with the daily carrying of the Cross, how could he be otherwise—he, of all men so clear-sighted in his grasp on reality? "Today", as it is called, disapproves asceticism, though, more or less consciously, it may in England tolerate, possibly even applaud, it annually, for a few weeks before the Boat-race. "Today" not only disapproves but often entirely misunderstands asceticism, which does not mean being hard, "terrible", unkind to other people, nor even inflicting pain on one's self for the sake of doing so. It means each one disciplining the self—each one his own self—in order to train it to be first willing and then desirous to serve and please God. As the nature of the self is to serve and please itself, such discipline cannot be pleasant or easy, though according to different temperaments it may be harder to some than to others. Someone is said to have said that what sufficed to make a saint of St. John (the son of Zebedee) just kept St. Peter from knocking a man down.

Another object of this collection is to show "the sequence and strict logical continuity in every division of his [Fray Juan's] discourse", on which Cardinal Wiseman insisted. The third is to set forth, if possible, his counsels to those who are trying to follow the "Three Ways": of Purgation, Illumination, and Union. The early stages of those ways stumblers must needs find arduous; and not only at the outset, but rough enough for them still to crave help, should they be brought on and on, along and up the final stages, at last to behold and even pass far horizons. Next, the world is now, has been, indeed bids fair to be in a hurry; whereas connected teaching about things worth knowing can neither be given nor used quickly if it is to be effectual and lasting. Lastly, the world is sad, not superficially but really; it carries the fact on its face, in its hungry eyes, about the streets,

at work and at leisure. If, in such conditions, a winged sentence may find a billet, should even one go right home to the heart, mind, soul of a single human being, it is not Fray Juan who would complain because what he offered connectedly to a very different era has been somewhat disordered, disconnected, that it might be rearranged to meet the necessity of an unsatisfied world living in a turmoil.

The extracts have been arranged according to content, and where their matter might seem to need it, some comment has been added. Though there may be found in them some of St. John's most intimately sublime teaching, there is nothing to substantiate reckless charges of harshness and "terrible" severity.

Public Affairs :

Take care that you do not trouble over-much about the troublesome happenings of the Time; you do not know what good they work, nor how God's judgements tend to the eternal joy of His elect.

[*Thoughts in Reply.*]

The Tongue :

It is more worth while to master one's tongue than to fast on bread and water.

[*Ibid.*]

Common Sense :

What is the use of giving God this when He wants that ?

[*Ibid.*]

Charity :

Gentle is the man who knows how to endure his neighbours and himself. He who has no love for his neighbour hates God.

[*Ibid.*]

Judgement of Others :

Reflect that though a person may not exhibit the virtues you look for, he may yet be of worth to God for virtues which escape you.

[*Ibid.*]

The Three Theological Virtues :

These three virtues, as we have said, empty the powers of our soul: faith empties the understanding; hope empties the memory, taking from it all hold on every created thing; charity empties the will, stripping it of every liking and inclination for what is not of God.

[*The Dark Night of the Soul*, ii, v.]

Love's Begetting :

Love, where there is no love, and you shall have love.

[To the Prioress of Segovia, 1591.]

*Obedience :**(a) The Core of Obedience :*

Obedience is Reason's penitence, an act of discretion : God values the worth of this sacrifice above every other.

[*The Dark Night*, ii, vi.]

(b) The Worth of Obedience :

God asks for our obedience before our sacrifices.

[*The Little Work*, for the Sisters of Baeza.]

Detachment :

Desire for yourself a robust soul, tied to nothing ; you will find sweetness and peace in abundance : savoury, sweet, lasting fruit can only be gathered in a cold and dry land.

[*Thoughts in Reply*.]

The Use of Capacities :

Like the senses, capacities should not be expended wholly on things, but only to the point of necessity ; the rest, unused, should be left for God.

[*Thoughts from Notes*.]

Renunciation :

Understand, then, what it is God wills, even if it obliges you to live in the midst of devils ; God would will that you should live even in such company without turning your thoughts' head towards their doings ; but let them all go utterly, trying to bring your soul pure and whole back to God ; so that no thought of this thing or that disturbs you.

[*The Little Work*, for the Sisters of Baeza.]

The Price of Perfection :

If you would be perfect, go sell your will.

[*Thoughts in Reply*.]

Detachment's Far Limits :

If you desire devotion to spring up in your soul, and, along with the love of God, to increase your longing for divine things, then unlade your soul of desire, of every tie, of every aim, until nothing disturbs you.

[*Thoughts in Reply*.]

*Courage :**(a) For the Heavy-laden :*

It is better to go loaded with a Strong Companion, than disburdened with a feeble fellow.

[*The Little Book of Françoise of the Mother of God*.]

(b) In time of Trouble :

In every tribulation run confidently to God ; you will find strength, light and knowledge.

[*Thoughts in Reply.*]

(c) Increase of Courage :

Courage and fortitude of soul increase and grow strong in troubles.

[*The Little Book.*]

The Tepid :

He who acts lukewarmly is on the brink of a fall.

[*Ibid.*]

The Arrogant :

He who trusts in himself is worse than the devil.

[*Ibid.*]

Pain : One Way of Wisdom :

To know how to be silent and suffer without taking any notice of what is said, done, or of what happens anywhere, is great wisdom.

[*Thoughts from Notes.*]

Pain and Knowledge :

What does he know who knows not how to suffer for Christ ?

[*Thoughts in Reply.*]

Pain, the Path to Understanding :

The purest suffering gives and brings the purest understanding.

[*Thoughts from Notes.*]

The Work of Pain :

He sends little trials to a soul : if it shews itself weak, it promptly flies from suffering, will accept no pain or mortification however trifling, and it wholly fails to produce that steady patience it ought to manifest. . . . Then, God, finding such souls neither strong nor faithful, when, according to His special grace, little tests were beginning to purify and polish them, judges that it is futile to send them any harder ones. Consequently, He does not go on purifying them and lifting them out of earthly soilure by mortification, which requires of them constancy and strength they do not possess. Souls are not uncommon who long to make progress, who vehemently ask God to deign to aid them, to put them into a state of perfection, and when God begins to lead them thereto, with the initial and indispensable sufferings and mortifications, turn from, steal away, flee from that strait path of life, to seek ease in that comfort which is the road to perdition. . . . Such are vessels of no use for anything, desiring to be perfect, but declining to be led by the way of trials which alone fashion the perfect. . . .

O Souls ! ye who dream of walking along spiritual ways in

tranquillity and consolation, if only you knew how vital it is for you to be tested by such trials, that through this suffering you might reach just that security and consolation ! If only you knew the impossibility of reaching the goal your soul longs for without such trials, how, without them, we slip back and back, you would not seek for any consolations, whether from God or from created things.

[*The Living Flame*, ii, v.]

Endurance in Pain :

For those who would have God test them to the uttermost depths of their soul, it is necessary that they should already have offered Him many services, that they should have been very patient and constant. . . . These whom God desires to reward in the essentially perfect manner, He treats thus : He lets them suffer, permits temptations to exalt them to the highest possible level, which is to say to Union with Divine Goodness.

[*Ibid.*, ii, v.]

The Presence of God :

(a) *In every Soul :*

We must realize that God is in every soul, even though it were the greatest sinner in the world. He dwells and is substantially present therein. This kind of union always exists between God and all creatures, since thereby He preserves for them the "being" they possess ; if He were not thus present within them, they would fade into nothingness and cease to exist.

[*The Ascent of Mount Carmel*, ii, iv.]

(b) *In the Willing :*

My Lord God, You are not far from anyone save from him who goes from You.

[*Thoughts in Reply*.]

God's Indwelling :

We should recollect that God, hidden and concealed, dwells in the substance of all souls, otherwise they would not continue to exist. But the circumstances of this indwelling can differ widely. There are some wherein He finds Himself alone, others where He does not ; within some, He finds contentment, in others repulsion : here, He is at peace in His own house, ordering and directing all things ; there, He is a visitor in some strange house where He is not allowed to act or rule at all. The soul wherein He encounters fewest individual cravings and tastes, affords Him the solitude and satisfaction which He finds in His own house ; everything is in His power, everything is obedient ; and because He is quite alone there, therefore also He is totally concealed.

[*The Living Flame*, iv, iii.]

The Soul's Three Foes :

This fact must be heeded well, every injury to the soul comes from one of her adversaries, the world, the devil or the flesh. The world is the least formidable ; the devil is the most obscure to her comprehension ; the flesh the most tenacious of all, its attacks last as long as the "old man". To overcome one of these enemies, we must vanquish all three ; weakening one weakens the others ; and when all three are conquered, the soul has no further battles.

[*The Little Work.*]

The Spiritual Journey—Material and Spiritual :

What is born of the world is only worldly, what is born of the flesh is only flesh ; to be good, spirit can only be born of the Spirit of God, who communicates Himself neither through the world nor through the flesh.

[*Thoughts in Reply.*]

A Clean Conscience :

God asks from you the smallest scrap of purity of conscience rather than all the "works" you might do.

[*The Little Book.*]

The Soul's Climb :

As regards the soul, to desire to go to God, without shedding one's cares and silencing one's desires, is like climbing a hill dragging a cart behind one.

[*Thoughts in Reply.*]

The Road to God :

The road which leads to God is not made of a multiplicity of considerations, nor methods, exercises, nor inclinations ; although all that, in a sense, is necessary for beginners—but of one indispensable thing, namely knowing how to renounce self inwardly and outwardly ; how to yield one's self up to suffering for Christ's sake, and to entire killing of self. By faithful use of this exercise, all other goods are won. This being the foundation and root of every virtue, if one neglects it or tries other methods, one is only handling occasions, and one gets nowhere, even though one may be favoured with dazzling illuminations or hold converse with angels. Progress is only real through imitation of Christ. He is the way, the truth and the life.

[*The Ascent of Mount Carmel*, iii, vi.]

Aridity and Spiritual Consolation :

God values your willingness to stay in aridity and to suffer for His love, more than seeing you rejoice in every sort of consolation, spiritual vision and meditation.

[*Thoughts in Reply.*]

Spiritual Flight :

The man who refuses to let his desires guide him, flies—spiritually speaking—like a bird that has not lost one single feather.

[*Thoughts in Reply.*]

The Right Reading of Revealed Truth :

Souls, in many ways, deceive themselves in the matter of God's revelations and words; they take them too literally and penetrate no further than the rind. Now, God's main aim in these communications is to give the spiritual fruit hidden in the words: it is just these which it is so difficult to understand, because this fruit is far more full than the letter, much more extraordinary, surpassing all verbal limits. That is why a man who insists on the exact letter of revelation, on the form or sensible image of any vision, cannot avoid falling into great error, and so finding himself all covered with shame and confusion. He has let himself be guided by sense, instead of detaching himself from all the senses, preparing himself to receive the illumination of God's spirit. S. Paul said this (2 Cor. iii, 6): *The letter killeth, the Spirit maketh alive.* So, in such cases, we ought to abandon the letter which impresses the senses, and dwell in the darkness of faith; therein, is the life-giving Spirit which the senses cannot perceive.

[*The Ascent*, ii, xvii.]

The phrase in the closing sentence, "the darkness of faith", is incomprehensible to a reader unfamiliar with one particular point, not indeed uniquely characteristic of St. John of the Cross, since earlier mystics were aware of and handled it. This teaching about "darkness", "obscurity" is ineradicably fixed in the ground and texture of the great Spaniard's apprehension. His treatment, however, differs in *The Ascent* and in *The Dark Night*; and, even from chapter to chapter, differs slightly in *The Ascent*; therefore it is not easy to make it clear.

Yet if there is to be the most tenuous approach to some sort of completeness of understanding here, the difficulty cannot be shirked. Help may be found in St. John's teaching about Purgation; but the exact point here is the obscurity of faith. The best way, probably, to make it as clear as may be, is to give a selection from Fray Juan's own explications :

We need to know that the Soul, before reaching the state of perfection, must, as a rule, go through two kinds of night. . . . The first night . . . is that of the sensitive part of the soul. . . . The second is that of the spiritual part of the soul.

[*The Ascent*, i, i.]

The rest of Book I of *The Ascent* is taken up with explications of the first night, as set forth in the poem's opening stanza.

Then, in Book II, explicating the second stanza, he handles the division rather differently :

We are going now to speak of the second part of this night, which is faith. It is, as we have said, the admirable means we possess for arriving at our good which is God ; and God being naturally, for the soul, the cause or the third part of this night, faith, which comes in the middle, is compared to the middle of the night. We may say that this night is darker for the soul than the first, and, in a certain sense, darker also than the third. The first, or the night of sense, is compared to twilight, to that moment, namely, when all material objects steal away from our sight. . . . The third part, the dawn, being close to day-light, is not so dark as the middle of the night, because it immediately precedes the bright shining and brilliancy of daylight, and it has been compared even to God Himself.

[*The Ascent*, ii, i.]

The "middle darkness" of faith and obscurity is so embedded in Fray Juan's teaching and thought that some of the more important passages must be quoted here. Any reader, attracted to him, and believing no longer in his "harshness", can fill up any gaps left ; though lack of space compels some such here, from the Saint's complete works.

Chapter vi of Book II (in some editions it is chapter vii) has been called the "key-chapter" to *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*. Perhaps chapter ii of the same book is the key-chapter in this matter of "faith as darkness" :

Faith, so theologians say, is a habit of the soul, at once certain and obscure. It is obscure because it makes us believe through truths revealed by God Himself, which are beyond all natural intelligence, and transcend ineffably the reach of all human understanding. Thence is it that this light of faith is to the soul like

deep darkness, because the greater absorbs the less. . . . Sun-light eclipses all other lights, which can no longer be seen when he shines ; . . . further, his brilliance, instead of aiding sight, dazzles it rather, being excessive and also disproportioned to visual capacity. So it is with faith, whose light oppresses and dazzles the light of our understanding by excess : for our understanding only extends to purely natural knowledge, even though it may have some aptitude for the supernatural, when it pleases our Lord to exalt it thereto. It can, therefore, of itself, know nothing save by natural means. The only knowledge it can acquire is through the senses, and for that it needs images or figures either of objects actually present, or representations of them. . . . Therefore, if we tell a man about a thing of which he has never heard, whose appearance he has never beheld, he will have no more idea of it than if we had never spoken. . . . If you talk to a congenitally blind man, who therefore has seen no colours, and if you describe white or yellow to him, he will understand nothing, however many explanations you make, because he has never seen colour or anything like it whereby he may judge. All that he can grasp will be colour-names, because so much he can gather by hearing ; as to their form or figure, it is impossible for him to conceive those, because he has never beheld them.

These instances, in however imperfect a manner, indicate to us what faith is to the soul. Faith tells us of things that we have never seen nor grasped, either in themselves or through objects resembling them, because there are none. We cannot therefore have any comprehension of them through our natural knowledge, because what faith teaches us has no contact with our senses. We know it by hearing, we believe what we are taught, or blindly submit our natural understanding to faith. For, as S. Paul says (Rom. x, 17) : "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." That is as if he said : Faith is not knowledge gained by any sense whatever, but rather the soul's assent to what comes by oral teaching.

Moreover, faith greatly transcends what these foregoing illustrations have offered to our understanding. Not only does it produce neither evidence nor knowledge ; but, I repeat this, it transcends and overpasses all other knowledge, and all sciences, so that one can only judge it by perfected contemplation. Other sciences are gained by understanding's light ; faith's is gained apart from that light ; indeed we must sacrifice this particular light in order not to lose the light of faith ; so Isaiah has said : If ye do not believe, ye shall not understand.

[*The Ascent*, ii, ii.]

Faith as a Dark Night :

It is therefore plain that faith is a dark night to the soul ; and that by that darkness it enlightens her ; and the further it plunges the Soul into darkness, the more it gives her light.

[Ibid.]

Darkness a Type of Faith :

We see a figure of Faith in the cloud which separated the children of Israel from the Egyptians, when they were entering the Red Sea, of which Holy Scripture tells us (Ex. xiv, 20). It was a dark cloud, but nevertheless it lighted the night.

[Ibid.]

The Soul's Rôle :

I say then that if the soul will be rightly guided to the state of contemplation, she should not only remain in this darkness as to that part of herself which deals with creatures and all that is temporal—i.e. the soul's sensitive, inferior part as we have already called it—but also in the part which relates to God, and to spiritual things, i.e. the reasonable and superior part.

[*The Ascent*, ii, iii.]

The Supernatural Element :

The word supernatural signifies what is above nature ; consequently, the merely natural remains below. Inasmuch as this divine transformation depends neither on the senses nor on human skill, the Soul must wholly and voluntarily strip herself of all trace of affection she may have for all things, whether higher or lower : she must do so to the full extent of her power, and then who shall hinder God from acting wholly freely, in a soul so surrendered ?

[Ibid.]

Whole and Half Faith :

The stripping must be complete, and cover everything the Soul might possess. That is why, even though little by little, she might acquire supernatural favours, she should always be watching to consider if she is really thus denuded ; keeping herself in the darkness like a blind man ; relying on obscure faith, her light and guide, and nowise on what she can hear, feel, taste, or imagine. All that is clouds, only capable of misleading and delaying her ; but faith is above our knowledge, our likings, our feelings, our imaginations. If the soul does not make herself blind to all those, and blind in a wholesale fashion, she will never attain that supernatural good which faith teaches us. A partly blind man does not allow his guide to lead him easily. If only he sees a little, he imagines to himself that he had better take the first road that comes, because he does not see a better : further, he

runs a risk of misleading his guide who sees better than he does, simply because his authority is superior to his guide's. So is it with the Soul. If she lean on any of her own knowledge, or on any one of her inclinations or feelings towards God, however excellent those may otherwise be, all will be worthless, and utterly unlike what God really is.

[Ibid.]

The Dark Way of the Soul on Earth :

This obscurity will end, as S. Paul says, when what is imperfect is finished, when faith's clouds have vanished, and when that which is perfect, namely God's light, has come (1 Cor. xiii, 10). We have a picture of this truth in Gideon's army. All the soldiers carried burning torches in their hands, but they did not see them because they were enclosed in vessels; but as soon as the vessels were broken, the light shone forth. So is it with faith, of which these vessels are the type.

Faith contains the divine light within; that is to say the essential truth which is God: but as soon as the vessel of faith is broken, which will be the end of this mortal life, then the light and glory of the Divinity, which it hides within, will shine forth. It is obvious then that a soul that desires to unite herself to God, and to commune with Him in this world, must inevitably enter in to the darkness wherein God had assured Solomon He would dwell (1 Kings viii, 12); she must keep close to that dark cloud, whence He deigned to reveal Himself to Job; she must carry Gideon's mysterious vessels in her hands. That means that we must act in the obscure light of faith, in union, through love, with God: and when the vessel of this life, which hides the light of faith, is shattered, we shall see God face to face in glory.

[*The Ascent*, ii, viii.]

Night, Light and Delight :

The Psalm *Domine probasti me* (Vulg. cxxxviii) has been called the "Psalm of the Presence of God". St. John twice refers to one passage in it, in relation to this "night of faith":

(i) Night is the faith [as it is] in the Church militant, where it is night still; it communicates knowledge to the Church, and, consequently, to each soul, the soul also being a night, since she does not enjoy the beatific vision of Eternal Wisdom, and living in faith, is bereft of her natural light. Thence, we conclude that faith, which is dark night, illuminates the soul which is in darkness; and so it is true, as David said (Ps. cxxxviii, 11): *Et nox illuminatio mea in deliciis meis* (Night shall be my light in my

pleasures), which amounts to saying : In the pleasures of my pure contemplation and of my union with God, the night of faith shall be my guide.

[*The Ascent*, ii, ii.]

His second reference to this passage is a warning :

(ii) The devil can . . . tempt her [i.e. the soul] in many ways ; through genuine knowledge coming from God. . . . If the soul takes pleasure in such knowledge, the devil can easily strengthen her tendencies and affections for it, and make her fall into spiritual gluttony. . . . Once the Soul is blinded, what is false seems to her no longer false, what is evil appears evil no more ; . . . then the proverb is true : *Wine is changed into vinegar*. . . .

All that arises, because, at the outset, she did not resist this pleasure she found in supernatural communications. . . . Therefore, to avoid this great peril, which may come from the devil, it behoves the Soul to reject all inclinations excited by supernatural knowledge ; otherwise, she is certain to be blinded, little by little, till she falls. Indeed, apart from the devil, liking, delight, sweetness in themselves all tend to enfeeble and blind the Soul : David would have us grasp just that, when he says (Psalm cxxxviii, 11) : Perhaps the darkness will blind me in the midst of my pleasures ; and I shall take darkness for light.

[*The Ascent*, ii, ix.]

The Approach to God :

To prepare herself for divine Union, the understanding must be detached and purified from everything which can reach it through the senses ; it must be stripped of everything which it might know clearly ; placed in profound stillness, relieved of all natural activity, in a word, established in faith. Faith only is the proximate and proportionate means for the Soul's union with God, because the likeness between her and God is so close, that there is no real difference between seeing God and believing in Him. God is infinite ; the Soul presents Him to us as infinite ; God is a Trinity of Persons, and in nature Unity, and just so the Soul presents Him to us. To our understanding, God is darkness ; faith also, to our understanding, is clouds and darkness. Faith is the only means by which God manifests Himself to the Soul, by that divine light which passes understanding. Further, the more faith a Soul possesses, the more united is she to God.

Such is the truth which S. Paul expressed in the text already quoted : He who would be united to God must begin by believing

that He is (Heb. xi. 2.); that is to say, by walking towards Him in faith. The understanding then must be in darkness and obscurity, in order to guide itself by faith, because it is under cover of this darkness that it is united to God, and it is in the cloudiness of faith that God conceals Himself.

[*The Ascent*, ii, viii.]

The Limits of Satan's Power :

It is in *The Dark Night of the Soul*, so overwhelming, so terrifying, as that book is, that St. John of the Cross propounds this doctrine—a doctrine of which not a few people seem unaware—of the limits of diabolical power. In an era when it is not unusual to deride the very possibility that ordinarily intelligent people can believe in a personal evil power, the testimony of Fray Juan, who expounds his point not only with singular clarity but with all the persuasiveness of his quick spiritual insight and intensity of experience, may bring us new matter for consideration, and to some readers even comfort. The doctrine is implicit in the first stanza of the poem which underlies *The Dark Night*, and is unfolded in the second and third. In so important, if little-thought-about, matter, it seems wise to quote the original, adding a literal rather than a polished or poetic version :

En una noche oscura
Con ansias en amores inflamada,
¡ Oh dichosa ventura !
Salí sin ser notada,
Estando ya mi casa sosegada.

A escuras, y segura
Por la secreta escala disfrazada,
¡ Oh dichosa ventura !
A escuras y en celada
Estando ya mi casa sosegada.

En la noche dichosa
En secreta que nadie me veía. . . .

(In a dark night,
With eager cares and love inflamed,
Oh happy fortune !
I set forth all unseen,
My house already being at peace.

In darkness but secure,
 By the secret ladder disguised,
 Oh happy fortune !
 In darkness and concealment,
 My house already being at peace.

In this happy night
 In secret, so that no one saw me. . .)

The hastiest reader must be struck by Fray Juan's recurring emphasis on secrecy, concealment, unseenness :

I set forth all unseen . . .

In darkness but secure,
 By the secret ladder disguised . . .

In darkness and concealment,
 My house already being at peace.

In secret so that no one saw me . . .

Without his explanations, the words *en celada* (in concealment) and *disfrazada* (disguised, which though it again means concealment is rendered in English by "disguised") convey not merely being hidden, but hidden securely, beyond possible injury and harm. No taint of fear sullies this suggestion of withdrawn, peaceful safety. Then St. John unfolds his meaning, showing who it is who is the soul's foe, and what are the delimitations of his power. The first slight hint occurs in line 1, since not all nights are wholly dark, and more emphatically in line 4: "I set forth all unseen". Then follows the explication :

This going-forth refers to the restraint imposed on the Soul, by the "sensible" part, forcing it to seek God in "sense" ways, i.e. by feeble, narrow, risky methods. . . . Now, behold her set free. The obscure night has extinguished the sense-appetites entirely. . . . That cannot fail to encourage and console every soul travelling along this path ; she will discover for certain that seemingly hard tests, hostile and contrary to spiritual inclination, turn out to be great sources of benefit. . . . No lot is happier than to belong to those few who having gone through the "strait gate", follow patiently, perseveringly along that arduous way that our Lord said leads to life (Matt. vii, 14). The "strait

gate" is just this "Night"; it disburdens and strips the Soul of the senses, so that the way which is closed to all who depend on sense, is open to her, if she leans on Faith alone.

[*The Dark Night*, i, xi.]

Then later on, he explicates the fourth and fifth lines together :

I set forth all unseen,
My house already being at peace :

Oh indeed it was a happy fortune for the Soul when God lulled to sleep the servitors of her house ; the powers, passions, affections, inclinations which dwell in the soul through sense and thought. Thus, unseen, unhindered by desires—for they are mortified, put to sleep in the night, they are left behind in the darkness, so that they can no longer notice or feel in their base, natural fashion, so as to hinder the Soul from going at her will out of the house of her sensuality)—the Soul reaches the spiritual union of divine love.

[*Ibid.*, ii, xiv.]

Next he deals with the two opening lines of stanza ii :

In darkness but secure
By the secret ladder disguised,

where the mystery of all this concealment is enhanced by two new images—a secret ladder and disguise. In his brief fifteenth chapter of Book II, he unfolds more of the matter and purpose of this secrecy and hiding :

The Soul . . . indicates the night's properties, as tho' answering some unuttered objection. She seems to say : Some one may be tempted to fancy that passing through this obscure night with all its tortures, anguish, doubts and fears and other frightful trials, I thought I ran a risk of losing myself ; nothing of the sort. On the contrary, the Soul declared that this Night was altogether favourable to her. She profited by it to rid herself of her foes by eluding them ; because they had barred the road all the way. Thanks to the clouds, she could change her garments, putting on three differently coloured liveries* as we shall explain ; and then

* White, Faith ; Green, Hope ; Red, Charity. (*The Dark Night*, ii, xxi.)

escape by a very secret ladder, of whose existence those servitors know nothing at all—a ladder, which, as we shall see, was that of living faith; escaping by “concealment” unseen.

[*The Dark Night*, ii, xv.]

He explains what that ladder is in Book II, chapter xviii. In his use there it signifies *contemplation*, by which, as on steps, the soul, having previously descended by them to self-knowledge, ascends to all spiritual good things. In chapters xix and xx he describes this ladder's steps, as SS. Bernard and Thomas Aquinas had done before him. Eight chapters later comes the vital explication concerning diabolic limitations; he propounds his doctrine of the limitation of the devil's power, and incidentally reveals the reason for all his emphasis on spiritual secrecy and concealment; “secret” containing the point of the limitation of this power.

Though it is common enough now to deny, in various circles, both the reality of the devil and the possibility of his power, the Christian Church, relying on the Old and New Testaments, and on a long tradition of human experience lasting down to today, has never countenanced that denial. To not a few among us it is so real a thing that this limitation of diabolical resource, so clearly set forth, so emphasized by St. John, gives aid not easily to be exaggerated. This fact should justify the inclusion of his argument in an account sincerely intended to serve some of us as Lamps by the way through this troublesome life:

“In concealment” means secretly or hidden. Further, when the Soul says she goes forth in clouds and in concealment, she does so to explain more clearly that complete security of which she spoke in the first line.

The Soul thus gives us to understand in this line, that by walking in darkness she finds herself invisible to and hidden from the devil, hidden from all his tricks and snares. The reason why the Soul can thus go free, sheltered from the devil's snares, is this. That the infused contemplation she has received here, penetrates into her in a passive way, i.e. in a fashion secret and unknown to the senses, as also to the exterior and interior powers of her sensible part. From this, it follows that not only because of this natural weakness these powers are unable to put obstacles in the Soul's

way, and so must leave her free to go, but at the same time she eludes the devil, who can know nothing of the Soul's interior, nor of what goes on within her, save through the aid of her sensitive parts. The more spiritual her communion with God, the more interior; the further removed from the senses, the less can the devil contrive to understand them.

Above all things then, the Soul's security depends on the nature of her interior relations with God; these must be independent of the senses, of the Soul's lower nature, which latter must be held in darkness, so that being unable to share in these relations, they are ignorant of them. Thus, on the one hand, the weakness of the interior part being no longer able to weaken the Spirit's liberty, spiritual communications grow more abundant; on the other, the Soul's progress is more sure, because the devil cannot reach her interior. In this spiritual sense, we can interpret our Lord's saying: Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth (Matt. vi, 3.); which comes to this: Let the right or superior or spiritual part of the Soul be unknown to the left; or rather let the lower part of your Soul never touch the higher, which remains a secret between the Soul and God.

[*The Dark Night*, ii, xxiii.]

He returns to this teaching in line 3 of stanza i of *The Living Flame*:

O living Flame of Love
How tenderly Thou woundest
The deepest centre of my soul!

which lines he explicates thus:

The deepest centre of my Soul: It is indeed in the substance of the Soul, inaccessible alike to the senses and the devil, that this joy of the Holy Spirit spreads Itself abroad.

[*The Living Flame*, stanza i, Explic. line 3.]

GERALDINE HODGSON.

DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI

DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI (1828-82) was the son of an Italian revolutionist who escaped from his own country, settled in England, and married an English governess, half Italian and half English by birth, Frances Polidori. His father's house was a centre for discontented Italian revolutionists of all classes, from organ-grinders to the nobility. Rossetti once invited the little group of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood to meet at his house, and Holman Hunt has left us a description of what he saw—no doubt a characteristic evening of the Rossetti household. A motley group was gathered around the fire :

The conversation was in Italian, but occasionally merged into French, with the obvious purpose of taking into the heat of the conference refugees unfamiliar with the former language. The tragic passions of the group around the fire did not in the slightest degree involve either the mother, the daughters, or the sons, except when the latter explained that the objects of the severest denunciations were Bomba, Pio Nono, and Metternich, or in turn, Count Rosso and his memory ; with these execrated names were uttered in different tones those of Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Louis Napoleon, who as a refugee had once been their visitor. The hearth guests took it in turn to discourse, and no one had delivered many phrases ere the excitement of speaking made him rise from his chair, advance to the centre of the group, and there gesticulate as I have never seen people do except upon the stage. When it was impossible for me to ignore the distress of the alien company, Gabriel and William shrugged their shoulders, the latter with a languid sigh of commiseration, saying it was generally so.*

Dante Gabriel was destined by his father from childhood for a painter, perhaps because of the talent he manifested in drawing pictures of his toys. The father felt this so definitely that he once reprimanded the boy for wasting his time on poetry when he should be preparing himself for earning a living by studying painting. The study of poetry commenced with his games with his sister Christina, in which they tried out their skill in rhyming. When only six he wrote a drama in blank verse

* W. Holman Hunt : *Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood*, Second Edition (1914), I, p. 108.

which he entitled *The Slave*.^{*} When only seventeen he was, according to his brother, "a practised and competent versifier".[†] Rossetti, however, was one of those individuals who never learned to settle down to work and do all the things one has to do in order to attain an end that is worth while. He did what he wanted when he wanted, and that was all.

Thus when in 1842 he left King's College School to take up regular training in art at Sass's Academy he seems to have attended or not according as he pleased. Tradition has it that when the professor asked why he did not come to school the day before, Rossetti replied simply and candidly, "I had a fit of idleness."[‡] And when he attained the ambition of every young student of art and was admitted to the Antique School of the Royal Academy, he was no more serious in his efforts to get down to business and learn the fundamentals. He came or not according as he pleased and finally gave up altogether, disappointed and disgusted with the work he was called upon to do. The methods of the Academy of that day have been severely criticized, but still they gave Holman Hunt his foundation and perfected the genius of Millais. Rossetti never learned anatomy and perspective and was hampered all his life by the imperfections of his technique. Having left the Academy he became the private pupil of Ford Madox Brown; but when the master tried to teach his pupil perspective and gave him the uninteresting task of drawing a group of bottles, the pupil again gave up in disgust and eventually went to Holman Hunt, under whose direction he finished his painting "The Girlhood of the Virgin".

The same spirit of *dolce far niente* dominated his after-life and interfered with his financial prospects. When given an order to paint a picture, even though he needed the money, he would put off the work and spend his time as he chose, doing what attracted him at the moment. His close friendship with Holman Hunt brought him in contact with John Everett Millais. Millais and Hunt

^{*} William M. Rossetti: *Complete Works*, I, xxviii.

[†] Loc. cit., p. xxix.

[‡] R. L. Mégroz: *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Painter Poet of Heaven in Earth* (London, 1928, pp: 340), p. 43.

were thoroughly dissatisfied with the artificiality of the Royal Academy. Holman Hunt had been captivated by the writings of Ruskin, feeling that they expressed essentially his own ideas of art. He converted Millais, and the enthusiasm of Rossetti made a movement out of what might have remained mere chatting among friends. With a few others they made up their minds to form a secret society which they termed the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and agreed to sign all their pictures with the cryptic monogram P.-R. B.

Holman Hunt thus expresses the fundamental concepts of this society :

Despite differences, we were agreed that a man's work must be the reflex of a living image in his own mind, and not the icy double of the facts themselves, *for we were never "Realists."* I think Art would have ceased to have the slightest interest for either of us had the object been only to make representation, elaborate or unelaborate, of a fact in nature.*

Still they tried to paint true to nature with a wealth of detail as actually found in nature. They deprecated the slavery of modern imitators of Raphael. They criticized Raphael, and their fellow-students said, "Then you are pre-Raphaelite." And Hunt and Millais accepted the designation.†

One day Walter Deverell broke into the studio of Hunt and Rossetti, telling of the beautiful model with reddish-golden hair whom he had recently persuaded to sit for him as Viola in *Twelfth Night*. This beautiful creature, Elizabeth Siddal, became eventually the wife of Rossetti after a long period of engagement. But Rossetti, because of his thoughtlessness, his unbridled temper, and his infatuation for his mistress Fanny Schott, made her life intensely unhappy. Violet Hunt, who claims that her information is based on oral sources and an intimate acquaintance with the chief actors in the scenes, says that Rossetti refused to stay with his wife when she pleaded with him to remain, and that while he was out she took laudanum. When Madox Brown came to her bedside he removed a little piece of paper pinned to the dead wife's nightgown which read : "My life is so miserable I wish

* Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 105.

† Ibid., I, p. 69.

for no more of it.”* Perhaps Rossetti referred to another note when he told Hall Caine “that on the night of his wife’s death, when he returned to her room from his walk, he found a letter or message addressed to himself lying on the table by her side”,† and that “it had left such a scar on his heart as would never be healed”. He never did recover from the realization that was forced upon him that fatal night, and an element of sadness is ever recurring in his poetry and painting.

Rossetti’s little story “Hand and Soul”, written entirely in one night in 1849,‡ is a revelation of his own inner life. It is a tale of an Italian painter Chiaro who as a child loved art and “endeavoured from early boyhood towards the imitation of objects offered in nature”. He tells how Chiaro heard of a famous painter Giunta Pisano and went to him and begged to become his pupil—just as Rossetti asked to become the pupil of Madox Brown. But when he saw the master’s studio he was much disillusioned. “The forms he saw there were lifeless and incomplete; and a sudden exultation possessed him as he said within himself ‘I am the master of this man.’” Can this be the expression of Rossetti’s own attitude towards Madox Brown when he left him because Brown insisted on his learning perspective by drawing a group of pickle-bottles?

He then tells of how Chiaro continued to work and eventually attained to fame. But while he was seeking his own fame he felt that his work was a service to God, and he offered his work to God that he might make amends for self-seeking in pursuit of fame. “There was earth, indeed, upon the hem of his raiment; but this was of the heaven heavenly.” But as he studied and worked§

* Violet Hunt: *The Wife of Rossetti*, p. 305.

† Hall Caine: *Recollections of Rossetti*, p. 198.

‡ Wm. M. Rossetti: Note in the *Collected Works*, I, p. 524. “Hand and Soul”, by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, reprinted from the *Germ*, Second Edition (Portland, 1900).

§ “In these early days with all his headstrongness and a certain want of consideration, Rossetti’s life within was untainted to an exemplary degree, and he worthily rejoiced in the poetic atmosphere of the sacred and spiritual dreams that thus encircled him; however, some of his noisy demonstrations at the time might hinder this from being recognized by a hasty judgment.” Holman Hunt, quoted by George Birkbeck Hill, in *Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to William Allingham* (1898, pp. xxviii + 307), p. 28.

he realized that life offered other channels for the satisfaction of desire. "And when, in his walks, he saw the great gardens laid out for pleasure, and the beautiful women who passed to and fro, and heard the music that was in the groves of the city at evening, he was taken with wonder that he had never claimed his share of the inheritance of those years in which his youth was cast." After a little, however, the pursuit of fame and pleasure no longer satisfied his soul. "But now (being at length led to inquire closely into himself) even as, in the pursuit of fame, the unrest abiding after attainment had proved to him that he had misinterpreted the craving of his own spirit—so also, now that he would willingly have fallen back on devotion, he became aware that much of that reverence which he had mistaken for faith had been no more than the worship of beauty." And so he sought another aim for life. "From that moment Chiaro set a watch on his soul, and put his hand to no other works but only to such as had for their end the presentment of some moral greatness that should impress the beholder." But though his works were "more laboured than his former pictures, they were cold and unemphatic." This passage is perhaps a criticism of the ideals and work of Holman Hunt. But one day the two great houses of Pisa fought out their feud within the very entry of the church where Chiaro had painted his frescoes presenting the moral allegory of Peace, and spattered his paintings with their blood. And Chiaro thought within himself: "Fame failed me: faith failed me: and now this also—the hope that I nourished in this my generation of men." And Chiaro fell sick and "the fever encroached slowly on his veins". "The silence was a painful music, that made the blood ache in his temples: and he lifted his face and his deep eyes. . . . A woman was present in his room, clad to the hands and feet with a green and grey raiment, fashioned to that time." And she said to him: "I am an image, Chiaro, of thine own soul within thee. See me and know me as I am. Thou sayest that fame has failed thee, and faith failed thee; but because at least thou hast not laid thy life unto riches, therefore, though thus late, I am suffered to come into thy knowledge. Fame sufficed

not, for thou didst seek fame ; seek thine own conscience (not thy mind's conscience, but thine heart's), and all shall approve and suffice. . . . Why shouldst thou rise up and tell God He is not content ? Had He, of His warrant, certified to thee ?—What He hath set in thine heart to do, that do thou, and even though thou do it without thought of Him, it shall be well done : it is this sacrifice He asketh of thee, and His flame is upon it for a sign. Think not of Him ; but of His love and thy love. For with God there is no lust of Godhead.* He hath no hand to bow beneath, nor a foot that thou shouldst kiss it. . . . Know that there is but this means whereby thou mayst serve God with man :—Set thine hand and thy heart to serve man with God." And then she said to him : "Chiaro, servant of God, take now thine art unto thee, and paint me thus, as I am, to know me : weak as I am, and in the weeds of this time ; only with eyes which seek out labour, and with a faith, not learned, yet jealous of prayer. Do this ; so shall thy soul stand before thee always, and perplex thee no more." And then Chiaro painted the woman that was the image of himself.

This little story is not entirely the figment of his imagination but really tells us a great deal about Rossetti's inner life.

Holman Hunt bears witness to the marked change that appeared in Rossetti's paintings in the exhibition of 1857 after he had spent some time in drawing and water-colouring :

When the first collection was brought together, Gabriel sent two excellent examples of his last oil work. He had now completely changed his philosophy, which he showed in his art, leaving monastic sentiment for Epicureanism, and after a pause, which was devoted to design in water-colour, he again took to oil painting. He executed heads of women of voluptuous nature with such richness of ornamental trapping and decoration that they were a surprise, coming from the hand which had hitherto indulged itself in austerities.†

Let us now follow Rossetti's development in poetry and

* " 'For God is no morbid exactor' was the original reading."

† W. H. Hunt, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 111-2. Cf. Marillier: *Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (London, 1899), p. 50.

painting and see how again and again he painted the woman that was the image of his soul. His youthful aspirations are expressed in a poem entitled "World's Worth" which was published in the *Germ* in 1850. A somewhat modified version appeared in the collected works edited by his brother.*

He stood within the mystery
 Girding God's blessed Eucharist :
 The organ and the chaunt had ceas'd.
 The last words paused against his ear
 Said from the altar : drawn round him
 The gathering rest was dumb and dim.
 And now the sacring-bell rang clear
 And ceased ; and all was awe,—the breath
 Of God in man that warranteth
 The inmost, utmost things of faith.
 He said : "O God my world in Thee."

And so in these early days Rossetti looked on the world about him.

The obscene deafness hemmed him in.
 He said : "O world, what world for me ?"

The ripples set his eyes to ache.
 He said : "O world, what world for me ?"

And then he had a glimpse of the utmost things of faith and

He said : "O God my world in Thee."

He could understand the vision of perfect loveliness found in the Mother of Christ and could sing to her pleadingly :

Oh when our need is uttermost,
 Think that to such as death may strike
 Thou once wert sister sisterlike !
 Thou headstone of humanity,
 Groundstone of the great mystery,
 Fashioned like us, yet more then we !†

* *The Collected Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. Edited by William M. Rossetti. (2 vols. London, 1890.) Vol. I, p. 250. Both versions are given in E. L. Cary, I, pp. 117-20. We quote the modified version as giving the clearer meaning.

† E. L. Cary : *Poems*, I, p. 113 ; Vol. I, p. 244, of W. M. R.'s ed.

He commenced to feel the temptations in the world about him. But at first he would not yield. Time passes and the world will be no more. Why tarry with what is mortal when one can be faithful to the eternal ideals of truth and beauty? This idea he expressed in a sonnet written in 1847 and its accompanying picture.

Retro me, Sathana

Get thee behind me. Even as, heavy curled,
 Stooping against the wind, a charioteer
 Is snatched from out his chariot by the hair,
 So shall Time be; and as the void car, hurled
 Abroad by reinless steeds, even so the world.
 Yea, even as chariot-dust upon the air,
 It shall be sought and not found anywhere.
 Get thee behind me, Satan. Oft unfurled,
 Thy perilous wings can beat and break like lath
 Much mightiness of men to win thee praise.
 Leave these weak feet to tread in narrow ways.
 Thou still, upon the broad vine-sheltered path,
 Mayst wait the turning of the phials of wrath
 For certain years, for certain months and days.*

Rossetti's idea of relinquishing all and finding his world in God never took the form of a strict religious asceticism; but rather of disdain for a world that could not appreciate the beauty of poetry and art. He became absorbed in drawing and poetry, turning from one to the other. But finally he commenced to taste also of that which the world enjoys, and, once having tasted, could never become again the innocent idealistic lover of art and beauty that he was in early youth. And this he expressed later in life by the picture and poem entitled "Proserpine". When we look at the picture of Proserpine we must realize that, as in all such pictures, Rossetti is trying to portray the image of himself. To interpret it we must recall the legend of Proserpine. She was the daughter of Ceres who was captured by Pluto and taken to the nether regions. Ceres obtained an order from Jupiter for her release on condition that she had eaten nothing. But she had tasted of a pomegranate and so she was never to be entirely freed from the lower regions over which Pluto ruled.

* *Collected Works*, ed. by W. M. R., I, p. 222.

And so Rossetti, having in early youth been true to mystical and poetic ideals and kept himself free from gross sexual indulgence, followed finally the lure of pleasure and, descending from the pure regions of a chaste and holy art, he came to realize at last that he was held a prisoner like Proserpine in the realms of Pluto. Had he only passed through the dark trials of life without tasting he could rise again to his former self. But now he has tasted and feels he can never again be what he was in the days of his mystic idealism.* With these thoughts in mind we can appreciate the pathetic appeal of the picture and the poem :

Afar away the light that brings cold cheer
 Unto this wall—one instant and no more
 Admitted at my distant palace-door.
 Afar the flowers of Enna from this drear,
 Dire fruit, which, tasted once, must thrall me here.
 Afar those skies from this Tartarean grey
 That chills me : and afar, how far away
 The nights that shall be from the days that were.

Afar from mine own self I seem, and wing
 Strange ways in thought, and listen for a sign :
 And still some heart unto some soul doth pine,
 (Whose sounds mine inner sense is fain to bring
 Continually together murmuring)
 "Woe's me for thee, unhappy Proserpine."

Rossetti's life is, like that of everyone else, a conflict between good and evil. In early youth the good definitely dominated in Rossetti's life. Then there came a time of trial, and goodness yielded to wickedness. Just as in some persons good dominates and evil is repressed and becomes unconscious, so by a reverse process in Rossetti evil dominated and the good tended to be repressed. The good, however, never became utterly repressed and wholly unconscious but in one way or another was ever rising into consciousness. This conflict

* P. T. Forsyth gives this interpretation to the picture and poem in *Religion in Recent Art* (London, 1901, pp. xii + 316), p. 4. The first study of the picture was made in 1871. (E. L. Cary: *Poems by Dante Gabriel Rossetti*.)

is expressed in a drawing he made in 1858 of Mary Magdalen at the door of Simon's house. The head of Christ is seen at a window gazing at Mary Magdalen. She feels that Christ is calling her and is tearing the roses from her hair before she enters and comes into the presence of the Saviour. Her companions are pleading with her to remain, but her mind is made up and she, as it were, leaving her companions, says to them :

Oh world, what is the world to me ?

and turning to Christ, says :

O God, my world is in Thee.

It is a figure of the conflict that went on throughout life in the mind of Rossetti—the face of Christ seen, as it were, in the darkness symbolizes the appeal that rises up in spite of repression.

The voice of Mary Magdalen's lover :

Why wilt thou cast the roses from thine hair ?
 Nay, be thou all a rose—wreath lips, and cheek.
 Nay, not this house—that banquet-house we seek.
 See how they kiss and enter ; come thou there.
 This delicate day of love we two will share
 Till at our ear love's whispering night shall speak.
 What, sweet one—holdest thou still the foolish freak ?
 Nay, when I kiss thy feet they'll leave the stair.

The voice of Mary Magdalen :

Oh loose me ! Seest thou not my Bridegroom's face
 That draws me to Him ? For His feet my kiss,
 My hair, my tears He craves today—and oh !
 What words can tell what other day and place
 Shall see me clasp those blood-stained feet of His ?
 He needs me, calls me, loves me : let me go !*

The poem entitled "Lilith"[†] was written on the frame of a picture called "Lady Lilith" which was painted in 1866. The first model for the picture was Fanny Conforth (Mrs. Schott), but later he repainted the face from another model. Fanny Schott was the evil genius of his life. He met her in 1852 and his love for her marred the

* E. L. Cary, I, p. 262. William Rossetti ascribes this poem to 1859; Elizabeth Cary to 1869.

† E. L. Cary : *Poems by Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (1903), II, p. 256.

short two years of his married life. She profoundly affected his later life and she haunted his dying days, trying to induce him to make a will in her favour.* Lilith, an inhuman witch, is the embodiment of sensual charm.

. . . Ere the snakes, her sweet tongue could deceive
And her enchanted hair was the first gold.
And still she sits, young while the earth is old,
And, subtly of herself contemplative,
Draws men to watch the bright web she can weave,
Till heart and body and life are in its hold. †

So he expressed the thralldom of which he complained in "Proserpine" that he could never be freed. And again in a translation from Goethe : ‡

Hold thou thy heart against her shining hair,
If, by thy fate, she spread it once for thee ;
For when she nets a young man in that snare,
So twines she him he never may be free.

In a companion poem and picture, "Soul's Beauty", Rossetti again attempts to portray "the fair woman that was his soul".§

Under the arch of Life, where love and death,
Terror and mystery, guard her shrine, I saw
Beauty enthroned ; and though her gaze struck awe,
I drew it in as simply as my breath.
Hers are the eyes which, over and beneath,
The sky and sea bend on thee,—which can draw,
By sea or sky or woman, to one law,
The allotted bondman of her palm and wreath.
This is that Lady Beauty, in whose praise
Thy voice and hand shake still,—long known to thee
By flying hair and fluttering hem,—the beat
Following her daily of thy heart and feet,
How passionately and irretrievably,
In what fond flight, how many ways and days ! ||

* "Fanny Schott, now bereft even of her physical charm, had come to the Vale of St. John with one purpose, to induce Rossetti to make a will in her favour." Evelyn Waugh : *Rossetti : His Life and Works* (London, 1928, pp. 232), p. 219.

† Cary, II, p. 257.

‡ *Collected Works* (edited by Rossetti), II, p. 469.

§ "Hand and Soul".

|| Cary, II, p. 255. Said to have been written in 1866.

He here expresses the purpose of his life—the search for and the perfect expression of beauty. He thus writes in “Hand and Soul”:

In all thou dost work from thine own heart, simply; for His heart is as thine when thine is wise and humble; and He shall have understanding of thee. One drop of rain is as another, and the sun’s prism in all: and shalt thou not be as He, whose lives are the breath of One?*

So Rossetti strove to picture human nature by picturing himself. Conceiving of his soul as essentially an image of God and therefore beautiful, and of beauty as the property of woman, he again and again strove to give expression to “the fair woman that was his soul”. His life commenced as the pursuit of an aesthetic ideal, but it ended by his being ensnared in the network of sexual charms, and he followed his own sensuality, which he mistook for beauty:

. . . passionately and irretrievably,
In what fond flight, how many ways and days.

Let us now approach the problem of the value and truth of Rossetti’s philosophy of life. Can the end of man be conceived of as the expression of himself? Rossetti himself has placed the problem on a philosophical basis in a phrase of poetical prose: “One drop of rain is as another, and the sun’s prism in all: and shalt thou not be as He, whose lives are the breath of One?” If man is the image of God, then the end of man must be the outward expression of the divine likeness within himself. Therefore, the end of man is to express himself. But when we say that the end of man is the expression of himself, an ambiguity is likely to arise and a false concept slip into one’s mind. That is precisely what happened in the mind of Rossetti, and the result was the ruin of his life. Within us all there are two selves striving for expression; the divine ideal of eternal beauty, and our own selfishness which is but the mocking caricature of a human being. So when we say that the end of man is the expression of himself and set about realizing the

* “Hand and Soul”, *Collected Works*, I, p. 394.

purpose in our own lives, we must ask ourselves what is it that we are going to express: the divine ideal of eternal beauty or the mocking caricature of a human being. And here we are so likely to be deceived. If the divine ideal is going to find expression it is necessary to hew away great masses of disfiguring selfishness. But this means work and effort, and nature rebels against what seems to be marring the beauty of human nature. Such an outcry, however, is only a defense reaction of the mind against long and painful effort. It is so much easier to conceive of the expression of oneself as giving free outlet and ample manifestation to natural emotions as they arise.

In this dream the image of Chiaro's soul said to him: "Seek thine own conscience (not thy mind's conscience, but thine heart's), and all shall approve and suffice."* That is, follow the promptings of your emotions, give expression to yourself by satisfying the desires of your heart and all shall approve and suffice. So Rossetti laid aside the restrictions of his somewhat puritanical home, forgot the ideals of his childhood, and gave expression to himself in following the emotional drive. He was seeking Beauty, but what only appeared to be Beauty and in reality was not. He seems to have been vaguely conscious of the self-deception when he wrote "much of that reverence which he had mistaken for faith had been no more than the worship of beauty".† And we might say that the worship of beauty became in his own personal life nothing more than the sensuous selfishness of sexuality. He strove to attain his aesthetic ideals by painting that which is beautiful, and so woman after woman was drawn, adorned with all that art could imagine as the background and embellishment of feminine charm. It seems as if he sought to attain beauty and make it his own by painting it on a canvas. But no external portrayal of the beautiful can beautify the artist himself, and if one attains to the aesthetic ideal it must be by an inner transformation of one's own personality. No dream can ever be a reality unless it leads to

* *Collected Works*, I, p. 392.

† "Hand and Soul", *Collected Works*, I, p. 387.

action in everyday life. One does not become beautiful by thinking of aesthetic ideals. One must conform one's life and action to the ideals of beauty, if one's own soul is really going to possess the beauty of its dreams. Nor can the beauty of the soul be pictured on a canvas, for it is spiritual and only the spiritual is capable of receiving it.

Rossetti clung to his ideals. True to the principles of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, he strove to express ideals by painting reality in such a way that it would be no mere mirrored image of a thing but the embodiment of a concept. And he attained his end in many pictures of exquisite drawing and wonderful charm. He painted a woman whose beauty symbolized the beauty of which he dreamed; the woman he painted, however, was not the image of his soul but the empty figment of his dreams. What he should have striven to be he made no effort to become. In trying to give expression to himself he followed the desires of his heart and lost all beauty and virtue in the mires of sensuality. His infidelity to his wife, his outbursts of temper, his thoughtless neglect, led to her suicide. The note she left and which he read beside her death-bed overwhelmed him with remorse, and in expiation he buried the little manuscript volume of his poems in her coffin. He wanted it later and had the body exhumed to recover it, and ever after his mind was tormented by what he regarded as the crime of the exhumation. But this was only a defense reaction which kept him from thinking of the real crime of his infidelity and neglect which drove her to suicide.

His last days were profoundly unhappy. They are thus pictured by Hall Caine, who attended him in his latter years.

If Rossetti's days were now cheerless and heavy, what shall I say of the nights? At that time of the year the night closed in as early as seven o'clock, and there in that little house among the solitary hills, his disconsolate spirit would sometimes sink beyond solace into irreclaimable depths of depression. Night after night we sat up until eleven, twelve, one, and two o'clock, watching the long hours go by with heavy steps, waiting, waiting, waiting for the time at which he could take his first draught of chloral, drop back on to his pillow, and snatch three or four hours of dreamless sleep.*

* Hall Caine, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

As early as 1863 he painted a picture of a woman which was the truest image of his soul that he ever executed. It was entitled "Beata Beatrix", and was nominally a representation of Dante's Beatrice in a trance before her death. But it is the picture of his dead wife and expresses the agony of her soul which his own infidelity and neglect had made her suffer, and it also reveals his own agony of remorse which abided and became more intense and intolerable as his powers failed long before their time and death approached.

In his later years Nature herself seemed dark and dismal to him and he wondered if ever again he would be forgiven and united with his Beatrice in a Paradise beyond the grave.

The sky leans dumb on the sea,
 Aweary with all its wings;
 And oh! the song the sea sings
 Is dark everlastingly.
 Our past is clean forgot,
 Our present is and is not,
 Our future's a sealed seedplot,
 And what betwixt them are we?—
 We who say as we go,—
 "Strange to think by the way,
 Whatever there is to know,
 That shall we know one day."*

He dabbled in spiritualism but gave it up, thinking the phenomena were due to evil spirits attempting deceits,† although he longed for an immortality when he would attain in reality to the love and dreams of his younger years. He thus writes to his dead wife:

Alas, so long!
 Ah! dear one, we were young so long,
 It seemed that youth would never go,
 For skies and trees were ever in song
 And water in singing flow
 In the days we never again shall know.
 Alas, so long!
 Ah! then was it all Spring weather?
 Nay, but we were young and together.

* "The Cloud Confines", *Poems* (edited by E. L. Cary), II, pp. 24-5.
 Written in 1871.

† Hall Caine, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

The Dublin Review

Ah ! dear one, I've been old so long,
 It seems that age is loth to part,
 Though days and years have never a song,
 And oh ! have they still the art
 That warmed the pulses of heart to heart ?
 Alas, so long !

Ah ! then was it all Spring weather ?
 Nay, but we were young and together.

Ah ! dear one, you've been dead so long—
 How long until we meet again,
 Where hours may never lose their song
 Nor flowers forget the rain
 In glad moonlight that shall never wane ?
 Alas, so long !

Ah ! shall it be then Spring weather,
 And ah ! shall we be young together ?

Judging Rossetti's philosophy of life by its results, it was most unfortunate. Self-expression alone is an inadequate guide because of its ambiguity. There are two selves within us all, the higher and the lower : the perfect man, the image of God ; and the fiendish ego in which there is no vestige of divinity. Rossetti truly saw that we must be as He and realized that in some measure we are now as He is. And then he said : "I need but be myself and I shall be as He." But he did not clearly perceive that as long as we are on earth we are not wholly as He is, but to a large extent as He is not. And if we say, "I shall be as I am", this may mean either that I shall be as He is or as He is not. *Facilis descensus averno* but *per aspera ad astra*. If we avoid all effort, and all his life long Rossetti shrank from effort, we shall never become as He is but more and more as He is not. The true philosophy of life is to shrink from no labour, refuse no sacrifice, spare no pain and no effort to become as He is. By sacrifice and unselfishness alone can we give expression to that image of ourself which is like unto God.

DOM THOMAS VERNER MOORE.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

Autobiography. By G. K. Chesterton. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 10s. 6d. net.)

A BIOGRAPHY is a review of a man's life ; a review of a biography must therefore be a very second-hand affair and can only have for its object to make its reader buy and read or not buy and not read the original. In this case there can be no question but that all should read, and the reviewer can only do his best to give reasons for so great certainty. Shall I say the book is full of good things ? But it is crammed with good things, filled to the brim, bursting, boiling. And what kind of good things ? With charity, magnanimity, humility, with fun and also frolic, with every kind of Geekish jape and Chestertonian verbal jugglery, full measure and running over. There is only one thing to say : Buy the book.

Verbal jugglery ; the words suggest some kind of trickery and therefore some kind of deceitfulness, and that is to suggest the opposite of the truth. But let us be simple-minded. The juggler takes the difficult apples, the ones we drop through our butter fingers, and does what he likes with them, dropping none, playing with them all. But they are the same apples ; there is no deception. It is only that he is the master of them, and he masters them because he knows them better than we do.

This is, I think, one of Chesterton's secrets. He uses words and plays with them—not as a cynic who delights in mystification (as who should say, "Men are all fools ; what can a wise man do but fool them ?"), not as a simple entertainer (as who should say, "Men will pay to be amused ; I will earn an honest living by being amusing"), but as one who loves words because he knows their real meanings, their forgotten meanings, the meanings hidden underneath their common misusage. It is for this reason that he is able to say, for example, "It is funnier to have a nose than a Roman nose", because he knows more about fun and noses and things Roman than do red-nosed comedians and anatomists and schoolmasters ; and he knows the sense and the Wisdom of the saying, "My delight was to play before him all the day." Hence it was that so many innocent but thick-headed persons were confused and even offended by what they thought his perversity and affectation. "Why can't he be a nice ordinary writer like——?" they cried in agony.

The book is rounded like a ring, and ends where it began. Neither are there any disconnexions or breaks. "The child grew in stature and wisdom", but it was still the child ; just as the paintings of

Giotto are the same in kind as what all children draw, and only differ in being more certain sure. And just as most children are frightened and shamed by the thorns which, in the guise of parents and uncles and aunts, spring up and choke them, and thus they become conformed to this world, so also do grown people put away the child in them. But it was not so with Gilbert Chesterton. That is one quality of this book, as it was of that man; and let those who scorn it or him scorn the Gospels also.

But it is possible to have the defect of a virtue; and in one sense it is true to say that to be always a child is never to grow up. In spite of his ever-present realization of the forces of evils specially powerful in our time—the monstrous growth of international finance, the vulgarity and dishonesty of the newspaper monopolies, the destruction of the common arts of man, the submergence of men and women in a dehumanized system of mass-production, and their rapidly increasing enslavement by laws which from his point of view and ours are so much the worse and more diabolical because they are the products of parliaments pretending a benevolence which is in the nature of things both hypocritical and puritanical—I do not think Chesterton ever grew out of certain romantic conceptions of the pre-war world. He never knew what it was like to be *post-war*. Wars, for him, were still affairs in which, moved by hatreds and angers, hatreds and angers primarily religious in their significance, men fought *personally* with one another.

In another and perhaps smaller way I detect phrases which indicate that Chesterton, for all his unbounded love of men, for all his complete innocence of snobbery, had not quite got outside his Victorian world, the Victorian world in which he was born and bred. It is a very small matter and I think I am correct in saying that it occurs only in two places. On p. 275 he speaks of the working classes, without inverted commas. In spite of everything, and above all in spite of everything that he himself had said, he still believed there were such people. And on p. 294 he speaks with a certain scorn of the proletarians, as though proletarians were more to be blamed than pitied for being such and as though their banding together against the common enemy, the capitalist destroyers of the world of human beings, were a thing to be condemned. If he had said “the atheists” or “the diabolists” or “the Marxists” it would have been “O.K. by me”. But proletarians cannot be condemned like that. Who are proletarians? They are those who by one wicked means or another have been robbed. Their name is not therefore a name of scorn.

In one other matter I detect a certain back-numberishness. On p. 298 Chesterton speaks of separating in the mind “the

scientific from the artistic; the ornamental from the useful". This may seem an even smaller matter, but it reveals a way of thinking characteristic of the Renaissance-Protestant-mercantile world, the world which reached its final complacency and self-satisfaction in the Victorian period, the world which is now dead, killed by the heroic and inspired efforts of such as Chesterton himself.

These things said, we may fall back on to, bask, wallow and finally rest in, the great solid four-poster of the Chestertonian mind. This book is not an account of all the exciting and interesting things its author did in the course of sixty-four years. There are very few physical events recorded in it. It is really a psychography rather than a biography. It describes adventures of the mind and the impacts of contemporary thinkers upon one another. And that is what we required—the history of his own thought and what he thought about the thoughts of his friends and fellow labourers. It ill becomes me to praise this book; it is far beyond so poor a compliment. It is like an immensely long and perfect after-dinner speech, a dinner at which are gathered all the speaker's friends and relations, a great family party—and someone said, "Tell us how, when, where and why you were born, Uncle Gilbert, and did you ever see Cardinal Manning, and what was it like in Kensington in the 'eighties and 'nineties, and what was it like at St. Paul's School and what were the other chaps like? (Yes, and tell us that sweet story about the head master and the lady who was particular about social standing.)" And then, having run through childhood and schooldays and the suburbs, and having, incidentally and apparently without trying, re-created and reanimated that most difficult of all periods—the one which isn't the present and isn't ancient, the one in which you were born—the speaker seems to say: "And, as I am on my feet, I'll tell you a few things about the curious chaps I've met in the literary world and in the political world and then, before I sit down, I'll try and tell you a few things about my special hobby which, as you all know, is gardening; for I have discovered that 'there is a complete contemporary fallacy about the liberty of individual ideas; that such flowers grow best in a garden, and even grow biggest in a garden; and that in the wilderness they wither and die'." And so the speaker rounds off his speech. And doubtless we shall all applaud and stand up and drink the toast to liberty, equality, fraternity, to love and song and all the little things which, like Little Flowers, earn the largest loves. And then we shall go home, with the chortle in our ears, thanking God for such as he, who spoke truth with charity and holiness with humour.

1900-36: in those years the great gas-bag of the Victorian world was deflated. Its hypocrisies were stripped, its achievements revalued in human instead of financial terms, its politics, its imperialisms, its empire-building, its flag-wagging, its money-making in soap and oil and in the souls of men—honours and the sale of honours, men and the enslavement of men—these things; we saw through them all, through a great hole, as into a stinking and bottomless pit. Then the pessimisms rose up, the illusions of the disillusioned—and the false gods and false worships, dictatorships, State-worships, totalitarianisms. . . .

There is a saying (the reader may have heard it) about emptying out a baby with the bath-water. . . . While all the reformers were, with every excuse, busy with the drainage, Chesterton was holding on to the Baby. Use the illustration how you will; but who will say that, in the morass created by our commercial and financial diabolism, the highest honours of a society claiming both royal and humane descent should not be paid to Gilbert Keith Chesterton?

ERIC GILL.

St. Francis de Sales. By Michael Mueller. (Sheed & Ward. 6s. net.)

THIS introduction to Salesian spirituality could hardly be improved: the commentator has entered with complete sympathy into the mind of his author. Dr. Mueller begins with the theological foundation and shows St. Francis taking a firm stand against exaggerated views of the evil wrought by original sin and insisting upon the radical goodness of human nature with its orientation towards God. On the other hand he fully recognizes the power of disordered concupiscence in the soul. But the Redemption has more than made good the evil of original sin; indeed St. Francis, and Dr. Mueller warmly upholds him, maintains the Scotist view that the incarnation of God in humanity would have taken place even had man never sinned.

The foundations laid, Dr. Mueller describes two leading features of Salesian spirituality: optimism and joy, and the call to perfection in every state of life. That Christian perfection can be achieved in the world is now a commonplace; when St. Francis wrote, it was little realized—those who aimed at devotion but could not leave the world were advised to imitate as closely as possible the life of religious. It was St. Francis who insisted on the distinctive vocation to holiness in secular life and on the distinctive type of piety which it involved. But we think that St. Francis probably, and Dr. Mueller certainly, are too ready to

regard liturgical prayer, the Divine Office at any rate, as distinctively the prayer of religious. In fact only the lesser hours were originally the prayer of religious: Vespers, Matins, and Lauds, the most important and lengthiest portion of the Office, were the public prayer of the entire Church, lay as well as clerical. Their comparative restriction to the clergy has sadly impoverished and narrowed Catholic piety. That St. Francis encouraged private devotions at the expense of the psalter, though intelligible in view of the general ignorance of Latin among the laity, was none the less regrettable. The better remedy would have been to translate the Office for those ignorant of Latin and to encourage the general teaching of Church Latin. And his substitution for the Divine Office of the Little Office of our Lady in the rule of the Visitation nuns, which Dr. Mueller approves, was frankly most unfortunate. The nuns were not even active, and to replace the width and riches of the full Office by invariable concentration on one aspect of the Catholic faith must involve great loss. Incidentally, we must remark that Madame Acarie was not a very fortunate example of perfection in worldly life. Though circumstances kept her in the world almost until her death, she became a Carmelite as soon as she was free to do so, and in the meantime she had exercised the unique vocation of a lay novice-mistress training postulants to enter a reformed Carmelite convent as soon as nuns could be brought from Spain to establish it. Her vocation was precisely to be a religious in the world—the reverse of the Salesian vocation. This, perhaps, was the reason for what perplexes Dr. Mueller, that although St. Francis admired her he did not undertake to direct her.

The third part of the book treats of the love of God as the centre of life and the resultant "holy indifference" and surrender to God's will. Dr. Mueller explains very well the difference between Salesian "indifference" and that taught by Quietism, as also the false indifference of the Stoics. The latter demanded that we should kill our affections; St. Francis that, while feeling them, we should purify them from evil and be detached even in our legitimate attachments; von Hügel's formula, a maximum of detachment in a maximum of (legitimate) attachment, aptly formulates St. Francis's ideal as Dr. Mueller describes it.

Anyone who wishes to understand the teaching of St. Francis de Sales could not do better than read this book, if possible in combination with the chapters devoted to St. Francis and his school in Brémond's *Histoire littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France*, vol. I, chapters 3, 4, and 5; vol. II, chapter 7 (these are accessible in an English translation); and vol. VII, chapters 2, 3, and 4, particularly the former. Acquaintance with these

fundamental studies enables one to read with profit and understanding both the ascetical Francis of the *Devout Life* and the mystical Francis of the *Traité de l'Amour de Dieu*.

E. I. WATKIN.

Henrietta Maria. By Carola Oman. (Hodder & Stoughton. 18s. net.)

IN her epistle dedicatory to that fine novel with the perfect title, *Tudor Sunset*, the late Mrs. Wilfrid Ward alleges that "the public demand romance from the writer of history, and history from the novelist". With this in mind, one approached this latest work of Mrs. Carola Lenanton (*née* Oman) with a certain apprehension, for since 1924, the date of her first novel, *The Royal Road*, the brilliant authoress, daughter of the historian, has written a dozen novels around historical subjects as widely different as the wars of Matilda and Stephen, Richard III, Mary Stuart, Shakespeare, the Regency period, and Robert Browning.

Henrietta Maria is no *vie romancée*, however, but a delightfully finished portrait, corroborating the vivacious wit, the girlish good looks, and the graceful domesticity that we know so well from Vandyck's brush, yet revealing a good deal more besides—a Gallic petulance, the wilful courage of a true daughter of Henri IV, the numbing agonies of a widow, the proud mother's busy solicitude for her children, the gracious condescension of an ageing dowager, the serenity of the surface a mere veneer over the heart-break beneath: these are the swiftly changing facets that make of Miss Oman's study a "movie" far truer to life than Vandyck's "stills".

In the life of so ardent a Catholic as Henrietta, constant reference has to be made to her religion. While occasionally showing an obvious impatience with Catholic devotions, Miss Oman has real sympathy with the self-sacrifice of the queen's Capuchins in Restoration London. But on certain points her ignorance of Catholic usage and terminology is inexcusable in a painstaking historian. The Mass is not an evening service, nor do Catholics have services in *honour* of any except *beati* and saints: they have what Charles II had for his mother, viz. Masses offered for the repose of the dead person's soul. A Capuchin (Fr. de Gamaches—with the "s") is made to wear a *soutane*, while the three Roman agents, Panzani, Con, and Rossetti, are spoken of as *nuncios*, a title which would have given them full ambassadorial status—obviously impossible in view of the religious situation in England. And Miss Oman goes too far in attributing complete failure to Sir Kenelm Digby's negotiations for help with Innocent X. At

his first visit in the summer of 1645, Digby was given 20,000 crowns with a quantity of arms and ammunition, and it was only Rinuccini's fear of the papal aid being diverted from Ireland that prevented him from getting more. It was at his second visit to Rome in 1647 that Digby found the Pope immovable; he knew by that time that Charles was king in name alone.

This successful study is nicely rounded off by a good selective bibliography, an adequate index, and several well-chosen and excellently reproduced portraits.

GORDON ALBION.

Old Nurse. By Barbara Barclay Carter. (Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. net.)

MISS CARTER tells us that her book has a two-fold justification: "the desire to recall what has vanished, to perpetuate the fleeting, and then, desire to share it". This is surely one of the best of all reasons for writing—and then one thinks of the host of reminiscences gone wrong; of emotion recollected in tranquillity become pompous, maudlin, or merely bogus.

But Miss Carter's portrait of her old nurse (and of herself) is authentic because she has resolutely avoided rhapsody and excessive analysis. Mary Ann is seen against her proper background, the town of Brecon, where she was born and whither she was to return when freed at last from the desired drudgery of the nursery. But between these two poles were the years of service in Germany, America, and England, "living other people's lives", as Miss Viola Meynell says of another nurse in her introduction. Yet Wales, and especially Brecon, remained a constant thing in her world of change. Her nursery-rhymes were Welsh, her stories were of Twm Sion Catti and of haymaking at Yscyborneuwydd long ago, and it was to Brecon that she brought her "last nursling", at first as a child on holiday and then as a friend.

If, then, it is Brecon rather than "Old Nurse" that dominates the book, this is as it should be, for Mary Ann was at one with the town and its "characters"—Alberta, Alice (who fought a battle with the War Office and won), and Little Tich the Curate. This is why the first part of the book, appropriately called "Patchwork", is curiously restless. Brecon is always the objective, and it is only when it has been reached that "Old Nurse" emerges in her fullness.

Mary Ann is described with authority, because the author respects what Mary Ann respected—the elaborate loyalties of time and place to which she was bound. And Alberta lives because her shop is made a living thing as well ("it remains

unique—even to the smell, a commixture of tea and turpentine and sugar and hot, fresh bread and warm flour”).

There is a prevalent literary fashion which represents Wales and the Welsh in terms of megalomaniac chapel-elders and stark passion amidst sombre hills. It is a relief, therefore, to turn to Miss Carter's book, which has, above all else, a right perspective. But there is no idealization. The incidents are representative and the characters are not distorted to fit the Procrustean bed of a literary device. Indeed, *Old Nurse* might be said to succeed as a whole because it is notably successful in detail.

J. ALBAN EVANS.

In My Path. By Halliday Sutherland. (Bles. 10s. 6d. net.)

IN one of his chapters Dr. Sutherland describes his experiences when broadcasting in a series entitled “Men Talking”, and it is an air of impromptu conversation which is half the charm of his books; he is at his best when ranging from one subject to another, as though reminiscing over his port: a man talking.

Few authors would dare to range so widely or jump from one theme to another with such abrupt transition, nor could they with such success as Dr. Sutherland: from comedy to tragedy, from the almost sentimental to the macabre. We meet here with the same range of characters as in his previous books: with the soldiers and sailors, the lunatics at large, and the young ladies with wistful Irish eyes a little dimmed at parting from the gallant doctor. But one is doubtful about the wisdom of inserting two long and very instructional sections in the middle, on the subject of tuberculosis and the story of tuberculin, not on account of any lack of interest but because they seem rather heavy and out of place with the rest of the book.

In two chapters Dr. Sutherland shows such definite talent as a story-teller that it would not be surprising to find him writing a book of short stories—especially as he must almost have exhausted his adventures and encounters. The first is a grim sketch describing how an old, useless aristocrat of the Mausoleum Club (what an excellent name!) submits himself to the process of rejuvenation, and harks back to his youth in the time of hansom-cabs and Gaiety Girls, only to shrivel and die with sudden and swift decay. The other is a brief glimpse into “The Perfect Eugenic State”—which is so horrible that it rather oversteps the mark, particularly in the description of a man, clamped to a trolley, passing through the “valley of euthanasia”.

To call this, or other books from his pen, the “English San Michele” is to pay a doubtful compliment, for Dr. Sutherland

is free from the exaggeration and sentimentality which spoilt that particular best-seller. One feels that Dr. Sutherland is not distorting the truth but selecting with the prerogative of a writer, that he is a man with definite and solid beliefs behind him, with a sense of the dignity of fallen man.

There are various ways of reading a book of this sort : one may be absorbed and read it through at a sitting, or keep it to dip into at odd moments. To a reader in the first way *In My Path* seems all too short, but anyhow it is a perfect book for a two-hour train journey.

C. L. C. B.

The Arabian Knight. By Seton Dearden. (Barker. 12s. 6d. net.)

THERE is certainly a grave danger of the memory of Sir Richard Burton, explorer and orientalist, slipping into deeper and deeper oblivion, and a definitive biography—which would have to depend principally on his own voluminous writings and the “lives” by Isabel Burton, Wright, Dodge, Hitchman, Stisted—is much to be desired. Mr. Seton Dearden’s “study” is useful as a preliminary sketch for such a work, and interesting to those who know little or nothing of Burton and his highly coloured career, but it cannot be regarded as altogether satisfactory, even as a short sketch. Mr. Dearden’s writing is wordy, and he keeps on commenting when he should let the story tell itself ; moreover, he shows signs of having insufficient background for his task, e.g. a Copt is not a Negro (p. 298), Abd el-Kader was an Algerian (p. 290), there is no need to write “Allah” instead of “God”, or—in spite of T. E. Lawrence’s example—to spell foreign words in more than one way (*harem, harim* ; Dahomé, Dahomey).

To say that Burton “spent his life dabbling in the *erotica* of the Orient” (p. 30) is a grotesque exaggeration, as this book shows ; but Mr. Dearden makes amends for such careless statements when he uses a confidential Foreign Office report to show the injustice of Burton’s summary dismissal from the Damascus consulate. Still, the savage king of Dahomey was quite right when he said to Sir Richard, “You are a good man, but too angry”—though he did not know the provocation that lay behind that bitterness.

Mr. Dearden is on the whole fair to Burton’s devoted but trying wife, but she is the occasion of several bad *gaffes*. No doubt Isabel Arundell’s personal religion was simple and even narrow : but we do not believe that she thought her husband’s eternal welfare depended on his receiving *viaticum* (p. 329), and it is quite certain that she did not “say Mass” on the Peak at

Tenerife (p. 242) ! And we must assure Mr. Dearden that he is mistaken in thinking that Catholic training teaches people to shut their eyes conveniently to what they do not wish to see (p. 157).
D. D. A.

St. Francis of Assisi. By T. S. R. Boase. (Duckworth. 2s. net.)
St. Anthony of Padua. By Nello Vian. Translated by the Rev. H. L. Hughes, D.Litt. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s. 6d. net.)

THAT St. Francis of Assisi should find a place in a series of Great Lives is no longer matter for surprise, though Francis would have enjoyed the paradox. Whether he would recognize himself in the portrait drawn by Mr. Boase is another question. A very good account is given of the main events, the background is firmly depicted, the writing is sympathetic and fairly objective, but when it comes to the central figure the artist is not quite so sure: he does not know what to omit, and the picture is somewhat blurred.

It is evident that the writer wishes to be fair. He is enthusiastic about the reports of those *qui cum eo fuimus* rediscovered by Sabatier, but he respects Celano and pays a fine tribute to St. Bonaventure (p. 15). The blurring is manifest when he speaks of the Church as condemning the Franciscan view of poverty (p. 43). Surely he has in mind the Spirituals whom he so admires? When he too lightly ascribes confusion of thought to Francis, so very clear-sighted normally, when he says that "consistency of thought never interested Francis" (p. 47), that among the unlettered men of the middle ages Francis must have thought of God as a "feudal deity, whose land of Palestine must be restored to Him in no metaphorical sense" (p. 32), I am quite certain where to look for the confusion—and it is not in the mind of Francis. There are other evidences of such confusion. Here is one: "When he was dead the wounds were seen . . . How were they come by? Miraculously and in a vision; by some strange but not unknown process of auto-suggestion; self-inflicted in an ecstasy of assimilation (and there are known examples of this amongst Francis's contemporaries); or even by some pious fraud upon the corpse, to strengthen memories of Francis's teaching on Alverna . . ." (p. 125). "Sanctity", concludes Mr. Boase, "is a perplexing subject because it passes our common understanding" (p. 136). The unfortunate thing is that when Mr. Boase writes about the ascetical side of mediaeval piety he allows his common understanding full rein. Speaking of the five Franciscan martyrs of Morocco he says: "It was the very folly of fanaticism, and its

crude aggressiveness lacks any true Franciscan beauty . . ." (p. 89).

It is strange, however, that this incident of Morocco should have been responsible for a very striking vocation to the Franciscan way of life. Dr. Nello Vian tells the story of this conversion in his *St. Anthony of Padua*, now accessible to English readers in the admirable translation of Dr. H. L. Hughes. It was the "folly of fanaticism" which inspired the Augustinian canon regular Ferdinand to walk out from the safety of his monastery at Coimbra into the wide world under a new name. He is now known to all as Anthony of Padua.

Dr. Vian endeavours to give substance to the name Anthony. Convinced that "all hope is gone of ever being really able to reach the innermost core of his character", he sifts judiciously legend and pious beliefs, and tries to find literal truth behind the parables; he is even satisfied to fill in with conjecture certain obvious gaps in the life-history of the saint. But in doing so he holds imagination well in check, and with an eye to the human side he gives what seems to be a very authentic Anthony. As might have been anticipated, it is a very Franciscan figure which Dr. Vian places before us, and that is as sure an approach to the right understanding of Anthony as any other. For if it was Francis who uprooted Ferdinand and gave Anthony to the world, it was no less Francis who gave Anthony to himself, in that full humanity which is always the authentic sign of integral Franciscanism.

FATHER JAMES, O.M.CAP.

Cardinal Manning. By Sidney Dark. (Duckworth. 2s. net.)

THIS short study by the editor of the *Church Times* is an eminently pleasing addition to the "Great Lives" series—well arranged, generally accurate in its facts, fair in its judgements. Mr. Dark quite properly lays stress on the English qualities of Manning and his lively interest in social questions: "He was an Englishman; he had played in the Harrow eleven; he had been an Anglican arch-deacon." Therefore "it became a little preposterous to describe a Church as an 'Italian Mission'" (Liddon, of St. Paul's, coined the phrase "Italian Mission" to suggest "the foreign origin and foreign allegiance of the Roman Church") when "its Cardinal Archbishop emphasized his British citizenship by a keen and independent interest in public affairs and had added immensely to the prestige of his Church by becoming the recognized champion of the poor". The settlement of the great London dock strike in September 1889 "gave Manning position and influence", but he had been actively at work on the side of the poor and

dispossessed for many years before that event. It was Manning who "along with Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore encouraged Leo XIII to issue the great encyclical, the *Rerum Novarum*".

Mr. Dark, naturally well disposed to the Christian Socialists in the Church of England, strikes a mournful note on the present condition of Catholics :

"Catholic democracy seemed to have been born with the publication of the encyclical of 1891. Writing forty-four years afterwards, it is tragic to note how the enthusiasm for social reform that marked the later years of Cardinal Manning's life, and gave the Roman Church in England for a few years immense influence and prestige, practically came to an end in his Church at his death. In this century the priests and prelates who have inherited his anger at social injustice and his zeal for social reform have, for the most part, belonged to the Church from which the Cardinal seceded."

Is the conclusion true ? And why should it be supposed that John Burns and Cunningham Graham "chained themselves to the railings of what was Morley's Hotel" at the Trafalgar Square riot in November 1887 ? It wasn't so at all. Mr. Dark exaggerates, too, in writing of the conclave of 1877 : "Manning could if he would have himself become the Supreme Pontiff." His election cannot be guaranteed anything like so positively. But these are not things to detract from the real value of the fine and appreciative short estimate provided by Mr. Dark. J. C.

Wrestlers with Christ. By Karl Pflieger. Translated by E. I. Watkin. (Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d. net.)

THESE essays are a thoughtful analysis of the work of seven writers the study of which repaid Herr Pflieger "with the gift of timeless value". All of them, three Frenchmen, three Russians, and one Englishman, are concerned with the real meaning of life, man's ultimate destiny. With one exception they reject "nothingness" as a spiritual unreality devoid of any greatness or beauty. Man's spirit transcending the limits of space-time, the visible world is too narrow to hold it. This is realized by some agnostic thinkers, though in anxiously seeking the way they fail to perceive that it is to be found only in Him who is "the Way and the Truth and the Life".

Léon Bloy, "the pilgrim of the absolute", is the subject of the first essay. The writer's reactions to this disconcerting genius are those of many of his readers : initial admiration, something akin to an illumination, gives way to revulsion against his violence

and frequently unjust abuse. But Bloy holds the man he has once touched, and when he again "knocked loudly at the door of a soul more mature" it was thrown wide open to the one whom many believe to be the writer the contemporary world needs most: "Seldom has a layman with hands anointed by the bitterest suffering to the service of God held up before the world with such loftiness and sublimity the flaming monstrosity of Faith", and such is the charity of Bloy, the poet and visionary, that his faults are pardoned and forgotten.

Péguy, "the good sinner", has played a great part in the Catholic revival in France, though his own position remained ambiguous. A convert, humbly accepting the teaching of the Church, he yet remained at her threshold and, hungering for her sacraments, died without them. Gide is "the prodigal son who went into a far country and wasted his goods". If it be asked why Chesterton, "the adventurer of orthodoxy", who fought for Christ, for orthodoxy, is among these "wrestlers", it is because of the German's love for the "slayer of dragons" and his deep understanding of the English poet-philosopher.

The three Russians are characteristic exponents of the Russian religious mentality: Dostoyevsky, "the man of the underworld", with soul torn between light and darkness, God and the Devil, aflame with love for Christ and yet fighting him with the subtlest and profoundest arguments. Despite his philosophy of the Divine Humanity and *Sophia*, the "world-soul", reminiscent of early Christian gnosticism, Solovyev's quest for the Universal Church brought him to Rome. But Berdyaev, who owes much to Solovyev's thought, is an exponent of a new "Orthodoxy" which embodies the doctrines of sophiology and anthropocentrism. However interesting is Berdyaev's philosophy, it is unacceptable to Catholics: yet, to quote the closing sentence of this exceedingly interesting book, "Reality which at every point overflows all fixed intellectual boundaries is so infinitely rich, the material of Christian experience so incalculably vast and comprehensive, that its fulness can be discovered by mankind only by gradual process and through many different pictures of the universe and many different types of thought".

B.

A Literary History of Religious Thought in France. Vol. III: The Triumph of Mysticism. By Henri Brémond. (S.P.C.K. 16s. net.)

THIS is probably the most important of the many volumes which compose the magnificent, though—alas!—unfinished, history of French religious thought, by the late Abbé Brémond.

The translation of the title gives a rather misleading account of the nature of these volumes. Brémond called it an "*histoire du sentiment religieux*" not "*pensée religieuse*", for it is not a history of theological speculation. Though a volume is devoted to Jansenism, the reader must not expect a full account of the theological issue debated. Brémond was concerned with devotion rather than theology, and with theology only in as much as it affects and is affected by devotion. I think "*a History of French Spirituality*" would have conveyed his scope accurately. This criticism is not intended to imply any disparagement of the translation as a whole. It reads very well and conveys the meaning of the original. We miss the illustrations of the French text, but presumably the cost of reproduction was prohibitive.

We began by calling this third volume probably the most important. It contains the distinctive contribution of the French school, of Bérulle, founder of the French Oratory, Condren his disciple, M. Olier, and others, not least St. Vincent de Paul and St. John Eudes, to Christian spirituality. That contribution may be described as a liaison between the mystical devotion to the transcendent Godhead and the Christian devotion to the human mysteries of the gospel. Both, of course, had always co-existed in Christian spirituality, but it was rather as two streams flowing side by side in the same bed. If, for example, Blossius in his *Endologies* contemplates with loving devotion the detailed mysteries of Jesus and Mary when in the *Institutio Spiritualis* he concerns himself with the mystical union, these fall into the background as exercises of a lower stage. For the treatment of the gospel mysteries is devotional, not mystical, confined as it were to the surface, to an imaginative contemplation of the scenes historically enacted, such as had been popularized for some centuries past by the Franciscan devotion to the Sacred Humanity. The French school represents an organic synthesis between the evangelical devotion to the human Christ and his Mother and the theocentric devotion to the transcendent Godhead. For it contemplates these human mysteries not externally and imaginatively on their surface but profoundly and spiritually in their depths. Not the external act as such is the object of this devotion but the state of its divine-human Subject and of his Mother. And this state is essentially a perfect orientation of the soul to God, which is the perfect adoration of God. When, therefore, we not only contemplate this state but "*adhere to it*" by an act of will we identify ourselves with it, or rather are assumed by it, and thus enter into its adoration of God. Thus in union with the states of Jesus and Mary we are united with their perfect service and worship of the Godhead and, moreover, in accordance with

the particular form, suffering or joyful, expressed by the mystery in question. For example, uniting ourselves with, "adhering to", Mary's state or disposition towards God as expressed in her *fiat* of motherhood, we share in proportion to this adherence in the substance of that maternity, conceiving in and with her the Divine Word.

If this necessarily brief and rough summary has not misrepresented the spirituality of the French school as embodied in the many magnificent passages from its exponents quoted in this volume, its distinctive value is evident. Without this interiorization, devotion to the human Jesus may all too easily become a superficial and too-human sentiment. This, indeed, has largely befallen the popular devotion to the Sacred Heart, which, as Brémond here shows, was originally a more concrete form of Bérulle's devotion to the inwardness of Jesus; the new Mass and Office recall us to a deeper and more spiritual understanding of it. On the other hand, the mystical devotion to the Godhead beyond image and concept, as expounded, for example, in the *Cloud of Unknowing*, is restricted in its appeal and in any case must remain in contact with God's human incarnation—the individual and social Christ—if it is to sanctify human nature as a whole. The spirituality of the French school, therefore, by which the latter leads to the former and the former invests the latter with its transcendent and "purely religious" value, is a distinctively Christian spirituality, divinely human and humanly divine.

We are faced today with a godless humanism which sets mankind in the place of God and, if it accepts religion at all, does so only as a sanction of human service and morality. Against this fundamental idolatry the French school places a religion concentrated in its essential disposition—the disposition, therefore, of Jesus and Mary—the sacrificial worship of God for his own sake: what Brémond terms "theocentrism". For this alone it demands and repays our careful study. We hope that the translation of this volume will be the means of inducing many English people to undertake it.

We must, however, remember that the approach to the Gospels made by the French school, the employment of their spiritual method, does not and should not involve acceptance of their treatment of particular episodes. They were, for example, disposed to supplement the silence of the evangelists about our Lady's early life by a reliance upon apocryphal sources which modern scholarship must disallow. Moreover, they were marked by a puritan rigidity justly unpalatable today. These things, it must be emphasized, have no bearing on the substance of their teaching, on the interior and theocentric assimilation of Christ and his dispositions, as revealed by the gospel narrative.

W. N.

The Mystic Life of Graces. By Hieronymus Jaegen. Translated by the Rev. W. J. Anderson. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, 7s. 6d. net).

To find in one's hands a book on mysticism written by, and from the experience of, a layman who was in turn soldier, engineer, banker, and *Landtag* deputy, is to feel a thrill of expectant curiosity for something which may revolutionize the Christian mode of life. Mysticism is nothing new in the history of the Church, and there have been lay mystics; but that a layman following the pursuits set out above should have the spiritual energy to follow that steep and lonely path, and the knowledge (and the humility) to record his experiences is something new in the history of asceticism. It must be confessed that after all these high hopes and at the first reading the book is something of a disappointment. There is little in it that has not been said before and, taken as a whole, said better. There is evidence on almost every page of very careful revision, and, as though this were not enough, the editors, Fr. Sudbrack, S.J., and Dr. Strerath, have interspersed, in Herr Jaegen's text, passages whose length must at least have doubled the size of the book.

But in the very act of formulating these criticisms we realize that they group themselves on the credit rather than on the debit side, and it is not the author but the reader who comes up for judgement for expecting novel and sensational revelations. If Herr Jaegen's manuscript had contained such, it is fairly safe to say that the book would never have been published. That being so, will it find many readers? Not, certainly, among those who are on the look-out for startling disclosures and esoteric experiences. The author follows the well-worn track of the Church's teaching, and whenever he evinces a sign of straying therefrom or even of lingering by the way, the editors, one on either side, carefully shepherd him back on to the right path. Even a slight knowledge of the theology of mysticism is sufficient to convince one of the necessity and wisdom of this carefulness.

Has the book, then, any value or importance? If we give an affirmative answer to this question we do not justify it on the score of originality; its claim on our attention lies in the very reason that induced the author, at his confessor's request, to write it: the conviction, namely, that a call to the closest communion with God may come to anyone in any walk of life, that it should be expected and that it may not be ignored. The present age fosters the notion of two standards of Christian conduct whereby asceticism is consigned to the contemplative orders, or at least to the professed religious, and a lower standard, which entails a

mere observance of the ten commandments, is considered sufficient for the rest of us. The author's contention that our Lord's call to perfection was addressed to all and not to a chosen few runs counter to that easy-going dualism which draws such a broad line between the counsels of perfection and the commandments. For this reason alone the book should be welcomed; it is a stern message to modern Laodiceans.

S. J. GOSLING.

The Pain of This World and the Providence of God. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (Longmans. 5s. net.)

ANYONE trying to write a book on the problem of evil is faced with at least three obvious difficulties. If the book is to be popular and easy there is the almost overwhelming temptation to superficiality, to making points too easily and omitting really essential elements. Turning from this Scylla, the writer is at once drawn towards the Charybdis of pomposity, to the production of a most complete and convincing treatise—which no one will read. And besides these two fatal temptations there is always the tendency to become so absorbed in the argument itself as to forget the manner of its setting forth and so to lose the sympathy, if not the interest, of the reader.

The skill with which he has surmounted these obstacles is some measure of the success of Fr. D'Arcy in his *The Pain of This World and the Providence of God*. It most certainly is not superficial—in fact, he gets in everything which is of real importance: and yet it is only a book of 150 pages. Moreover, it is in no sense whatever either a synopsis of arguments or a skeleton treatise. The points are fully and almost leisurely argued, and there is no sense of condensation. The form of the book is that of a debate attended by the author at the request of a friend. A paper is read by a Catholic layman, and a discussion follows which is concluded by a speech by a priest. This framework is not over-emphasized, but it is not forgotten; one does not feel the machinery working, but the illusion is cleverly and lightly kept up. This quite successfully prevents any sense of a treatise. But a danger of this use of puppets is that those on the side of the angels should alone have force and fire and those on the enemy's side be mere men of straw. Father D'Arcy argues the opposition case with real force and point, and even with feeling. He makes one wonder, "What will the next man say to this?"

The book is then really good reading and should be extremely useful. It states live arguments and makes real points. Perhaps one of the best parts is the discussion on the problem of the pain

of animals, which is so often brought up nowadays as insoluble. Father D'Arcy's treatment is illuminating and strong, and his suggestion as to the possible part the Devil may play in the matter is distinctly interesting. For the book as a whole we have nothing but praise, but what does Father D'Arcy mean by the conclusion? It is either very recondite or rather weak.

D. D. P.

Cabinet Government. By W. Ivor Jennings. (Cambridge University Press. 21s. net.)

IN the heyday of the Home-Rule movement some of the Irish members were wont to use a plausible argument founded on the English party-system for Irish self-government. "The Conservative Government is said by the Liberal Opposition to be unfit to govern, and the Liberal Government is said by the Conservative Opposition to be unfit to govern. We believe them both. It is manifest" (so the Irish members argued) "that no English government is fit to rule Ireland."

In his new book on *Cabinet Government* the existence of the party-system is said by Dr. Ivor Jennings to be of the essence of democratic government. "The democratic system implies an appeal to the people by contending parties supporting different policies. It demands not only a parliamentary majority but also a parliamentary minority. The minority attacks the Government because it denies the principles of its policy. The Opposition is at once the alternative to the Government and a focus for the discontent of the people. Its function is almost as important as that of the Government." There is perhaps a fallacy in the statement that the minority attacks the Government because it denies the principles of its policy. Is it in fact so? On a later page we are told that "The acceptance of collectivist principles by all political parties has much reduced the area of Treasury control". If all political parties accept collectivist principles, then there is an agreement between the Government and the Opposition in the essential principles of their policy in home affairs. In matters of foreign policy, as Dr. Jennings tells us at p. 68, the principle of continuity operates. There is no reversal by a Labour government of the decisions on foreign policy made by their Conservative or National predecessors.

The acceptance by all political parties of collectivist principles in politics affords an explanation of a phenomenon which strikes the observer in England and elsewhere in our own time. It is that Catholic opinion in politics is almost entirely ineffective. The thing is manifest in England (and never more manifest than

in connexion with the recent Divorce Bill introduced by Mr. A. P. Herbert). Even the Irish are ineffective in English politics, though they must number a good million votes. From this ineffectiveness a certain inference may be drawn: it is that there is no popular initiative in the English political system. Even organized labour is deflected from its natural line of thought and political development by an alien philosophy which is imposed by the bourgeois intellectuals of the Fabian and other societies.

If the popular initiative in politics is thus frustrated or denied, how can one say that the fundamental principle of the English constitution is that of democracy? And that "the House of Commons and the Cabinet are the instruments of democracy"? It is true that Dr. Jennings hastens to add (at p. 17) that "the responsibility of the Government to the House of Commons must be understood in a peculiar sense". In a final chapter on Government and Parliament the peculiarity appears. The chapter opens with a section on The Strength of the Government. "The function of Parliament", we are told, "is not to govern but to criticise. The Government's majority exists to support the Government. The function of the Opposition is to secure a majority against the Government at the next general election and thus to replace the Government. It is not untrue to say that the most important part of Parliament is the Opposition in the House of Commons." It may strike some minds as an odd saying.

Again, at p. 357, "Not since 1866 has there been any real control of the Government by the House of Commons. So long as the Party holds, it is the Government that controls the House and not the House that controls the Government." It would seem to be a complete denial in practice of the theory that the constituencies control Parliament, and that Parliament controls the Cabinet. Elsewhere, at p. 221, we are told that the "Party-system, as the Fascists know, is the real enemy of Fascism". One had thought that the real enemy of Fascism, and its cause, was Bolshevism. Fascism would seem to have in its historical origin little relation to the party-system. And the party-system, as this volume seems to show, is no guarantee of real democratic government. Indeed, in his essay on contemporary England Mr. Belloc describes England as an Aristocratic State. The explanation which Dr. Jennings gives of the operation of English political institutions would seem to confirm the analysis.

The work is a careful and (in large measure) an inductive study, based on the available documents, of the development of the English Cabinet system since the year 1832. It is the first monograph (so far as we know) on the Cabinet; and, coming from a

writer of Dr. Jennings's eminence, it will take its place at once as a work of authority. There are few errors. Those that concern Archbishop Davidson of Canterbury have been pointed out elsewhere. At p. 96, Sir William Robertson strangely appears as Sir Henry Robertson.

RICHARD O'SULLIVAN.

Westminster Abbey: the Empire's Crown. By Jocelyn Perkins, M.A., D.C.L., F.S.A. (Duckworth. 7s. 6d. net.)

IN this year of coronation we can do with another full but popular book on the collegiate church of St. Peter at Westminster, one that can be used equally well as a guide and for ordinary reading. That it is written by so intimate an authority as the present sacrist of the church is a special recommendation (Dr. Perkins has already three books on aspects of the Abbey to his credit, as well as one on the coronation, and others).

Some of us may demur at giving Westminster Abbey church such a title as "the Empire's Crown", but there can be no question that its position as the first church, so far as prestige is concerned, of this realm of England can be challenged only by Canterbury minster: in particular, many people feel an enthusiasm for Westminster who are left cold by its secular rival on top of Ludgate Hill. Dr. Perkins's treatment is chronological, not topographical: he begins with the Isle of Thorns in the midst of the dreary waste around the watery Thames ditches and works through a thousand years and more, down to the burial of the Unknown Soldier and of soldiers, literal and figurative, not unknown. This history naturally falls into two parts (whose extremes may be figuratively contrasted in the monuments of Eleanor of Castile and of Lady Nightingale), and Dr. Perkins's book is about equally divided between them; before he reaches "Elizabetha Fundatrix" he pays a pleasing tribute to Abbot Feckenham—which we should like to have seen completed by a reference to the *conventus* of St. Lawrence at Ampleforth.

The combination of history with archaeology is attractively and skilfully done, and is reinforced by numerous illustrations, some of which (e.g. of St. Edward's coffin, from above) are as unusual as they are interesting. As a general up-to-date account of the history, buildings, monuments, and present life of the Abbey this book would be difficult to excel—even though some readers may think that too much emphasis is put on the fourth word in the phrase "full stream of national life".

T. O. P.

Forgotten Shrines. By Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B., M.A., F.S.A.
(Burns Oates & Washbourne. 12s. 6d. net.)

THERE must be many who have long coveted a copy of Dom Bede Camm's famous *Forgotten Shrines* who are now enabled to possess one by its reissue at less than a half of the original price. The stout crown-quarto volume was first published in 1910, and the following quarter of a century has brought changes even to forgotten shrines; but to republish it at so low a price would allow no bringing down to date of the text and consequent resetting of pages of type: research has brought fresh facts to light, martyrs referred to as "venerable" are now beatified, the circumstances of some of the places described—e.g. Padley chapel, Wardley Hall, Harvington Hall, Pembridge Castle—have altered, and these things remain described as they were twenty-five years ago. But this does not seriously compromise the value of the work, and its reissue may be taken to be a testimony to another change, namely, that as a result of Fr. Bede's labour of love most of these shrines are no longer forgotten.

England and Wales are full of topographical relics of the Catholic martyrs and penal times: *Forgotten Shrines* is only a selection, a score or so, chiefly from the north and midlands. Every one is of interest, but two are outstanding for their thrillingness; they would provoke the authentic "historical shudder" even though they were without religious associations for the reader or visitor—I refer to the treasure (chalice, altar-stone, etc., and the celebrant's head) of Chaigley and to the attic chapel at Purshall Hall. After reading of these one is the more alarmed by the frequency of the partition, removal, and alteration of relics: I do not refer to relics in the primary ecclesiastical sense (though there is a strong case to be made against the further dismembering of human bodies) but to such performances as the alterations to the Mass-house at Egton Bridge and the removal of its furniture, the cutting up into small relics (*vulgo* souvenirs) of the ladder leading to a martyr's refuge, and the adornment of the Burgess missionary altar with what Fr. Bede calls "various pious ornaments". For that matter, I should be glad had Fr. Bede been more sparing of his own "pious ornaments" in the form of facile improving comments and romantic reflexions which consort ill with the historical and other facts, fruit of years of research and inquiry, with which this volume is crammed.

All the original illustrations have been included, some 150 of them, mostly full-page reproductions of photographs. These alone would make *Forgotten Shrines* a precious book. It is one that should be in every school, convent, and public library and on the

shelves of every Catholic—indeed, of every Englishman—who is interested in the history of his country and its extant material remains: by making it available at so low a price the publishers have done the public a really good service. A. D.

Dreams and Memories. By T. P. Ellis. (Welsh Outlook Press, Newtown. 3s. 6d. net.)

THOSE who had the privilege of knowing T. P. Ellis, Dolgelley, will be delighted at the publication in book form of a selection of his lectures and essays, and it should appeal to the wider public of all those who are concerned for things of beauty and good report.

T. P. Ellis was sadly aware that years in India had put him somewhat out of touch with modern Wales and with that younger Welsh generation, itself out of touch with the noble traditions he so greatly valued, which regarded him as old-fashioned. Accordingly, after his retirement in 1923, and especially after he became a Catholic in 1929, he laid himself out by tongue and pen to explain to his fellow countrymen what he meant—incidentally explaining something of themselves to themselves.

The articles in *Dreams and Memories* are all, except for two or three amusing sketches from India, concerned with Wales, her history and culture: they range from fairies (an excellent essay) to prehistoric remains in Merioneth, from personal names to an account of the position of women in Wales a thousand years ago in which he makes full use of his knowledge of tribal law and custom. Ellis was a passionate believer in his people, and "Our Raison d'Etre" is a sensitive and fine apologia; but—alas!—"Wales was once the land of Owain Glyndwr; it is fast becoming the land of Mrs. Jones the Gas."

His humanity and wide-spiritedness are well illustrated by the following (remember he had been a judge): "Though I don't poach myself I have a nodding acquaintance with lots who do, and on the whole I find them rather a decent crowd." But just occasionally he was a little too forthright, and I think that had he prepared this book for press himself he would have modified some expressions in the first four pages of the article on Glyndwr and the Church.

If this one is well received, a further volume is promised—an additional reason for buying and recommending it. A. D.

I Took Off My Tie. By Hugh Massingham. (Heinemann. 7s. 6d. net.)

MR. HUGH MASSINGHAM tells us that his book is "a plain statement of fact set down with all the objectivity of which I am

capable". Presumably this means that some actual experiences have been written up into a sort of novel, for we can hardly suppose that the author, having achieved an almost mystical relation of comradeship with certain poor families in a London slum, would have gone back to his own world and put them all, with nothing but a change of names, straight into a book of photographic and largely unflattering detail. He describes how he lived for several months amongst the very poor, and did so in the most difficult and curiosity-provoking way, continuing his ordinary occupation in a London office during the daytime, then changing into shabby clothes to go and spend the evening and night at his rooms in the East End. Naturally at first he was the object of suspicion and active dislike, not altogether unmerited since he had gone to study the East-Enders in a spirit of pure inquiry as an explorer might go to study some savage tribe; and the book is mainly the story of a gradual change of heart both in the author and in his neighbours. Incidentally it also gives a true enough picture, not even so black as might be painted, of living conditions in the poorest parts of any large town: the verminous houses, the contrasts of vice and virtue, the difficulties of life on the dole or off it, the heartbreaking business of unemployment.

On such matters the author's own judgement is always sensible and understanding. Of charitable organizations, for instance, he says, "Judged by the solid good work, by the hundreds of men they have helped, they have justified their existence a thousand times over", but "the spongers force the societies to protect themselves, and the regulations immediately destroy that generous and human contact without which charity is useless. I am not surprised that many men hate the charities from which they get money." Of betting and drinking: "both were an inevitable outlet for people who lived in utterly dreary and monotonous conditions. The bet on the horse—what an escape it meant for them! It kept the day exciting, and it presented to them the prospect of getting out of the debt into which they had hopelessly fallen." He understands that there is nothing wrong with the poor but their poverty. Of a married woman of easy morals (her husband being in prison) he remarks: "Somehow she had to provide for her family, and not being a cadger, and detesting the impertinent enquiries of the public assistance committees, she preferred to remain independent. . . . For her, prostitution meant freedom, which she prized above anything. It was a sort of virtue in her. The truth is that had somebody given her sufficient money on which to live, she would, I am sure, have been as respectable as most of the other women in the street."

As a study of slum-conditions this book is only one amongst many others ; it does seem to have startled the reviewers, however—possibly because it takes the unusual course of printing every time in full a very common but obscene expletive. The genuine interest of the book is in the picture drawn of the narrator himself—very young, with his innocent snobbishness and his public-school accent, introvert, bookish, moody, self-dramatizing, unpractical, and yet with a fundamental humility and teachableness that save him in the end and enable him to make the human contacts which he realized were a matter of spiritual life or death for him.

F. H. D.

Economic and Social History of Mediaeval Europe. By H. Pirenne. Translated by J. E. Clegg. (Kegan Paul. 6s. net.)

THE appearance of an English translation of Professor Pirenne's book is something of an event. It will fill a need which was beginning to be acute, the need of an accurate and balanced survey of the economic development of Europe during the middle ages which should be something more than a sketchy outline and which should provide a reliable introduction to the main problems of the subject. Moreover, the truth in the proverb *Der Mensch ist was er isst* is now so generally recognized that there is a real danger of the popular judgement becoming distorted by the flood of superficial "outlines" of economic history written by those whose restriction prevents them from using Marx without succumbing to him. Professor Pirenne's balanced presentation with its excellent apparatus of references and bibliography, as well as the ability of the publishers to produce a book of this standing for six shillings, is therefore particularly valuable.

Furthermore, the book is an excellent companion volume to Professor Fanfani's *Catholicism, Protestantism and Capitalism*, a translation of which appeared last year, for a knowledge of the mediaeval foundations of modern Europe is essential for an understanding of its present problems. Today continental scholarship has destroyed the old liberal conception of a break between the modern and mediaeval world orders. In 1895 Lord Acton could declare that "the modern age did not proceed from the mediaeval by normal succession . . . it founded a new order of things, under a law of innovation, sapping the ancient reign of continuity". The day of such resonant generalizations is long past. As Professor Pirenne shows, all the main social and economic problems and movements of modern times have their roots—and a great deal more than their roots—in the civilization of the mediaeval world. An economic revolution, based on the revival

of Mediterranean trade, the genesis and activities of a middle class, the problems of credit, banking, and an export trade under a highly developed capitalism, were all to be found in mediaeval Europe.

This book has the rare merit of apt and lucid arrangement, which enables the reader to follow the whole process of complicated development without loss of perspective. As a random example, the economic and social significance of the new Cistercian agriculture may be quoted. Professor Pirenne has given us a book which, while it is valuable to the historian, can yet be confidently recommended to the average well-read man who wishes to comprehend the past of Europe. In fact, it is precisely the latter who should acquire the book as a permanently valuable addition to his library.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS.

Catholic Social Action: Principles, Purpose and Practice. By Fr. A. M. Crofts, O.P. (Ouseley. 7s. 6d. net.)

A Primer of Social Science. By Mgr. Henry Parkinson, D.D. 6th edition. (P. S. King & Son. 3s. net.)

MGR. BYRNE in his introduction commends the work of Fr. Crofts for its presentation of "primary and authoritative sources—especially the writings of the present pope and of Leo XIII and Pius X". Fr. Crofts himself declares there is "but one main source of information in a book on Catholic Action": papal encyclicals form "the basis of all teaching on the apostolate of the laity". Throughout the volume it is by apt quotation from these encyclicals and other papal documents that the argument is advanced: the nature, necessity, and purpose of this Catholic Action; the preparation for the lay apostolate—with strong emphasis on the setting-up of study circles in each parish; the need of "docile relations" with the clergy; the attitude to political issues illustrated by memorable words from the letter of Pope Leo XIII to the Spanish bishops in 1882—"You must never consent that the interests of religion be mixed up with political discussions"—thus Fr. Crofts concludes the first five parts of his book. For the rest the importance of organization and various ways and means of Catholic Action through public lectures, the press, and the "apostolate of the schools" are enjoined. Though primarily it is for Ireland that the injunctions are directed there is much in Fr. Crofts's appeal and instruction that applies to England.

The weakness of the book lies in its too hasty historical generalizations. Praising the industrial revolution as "a good thing in itself", Fr. Crofts finds the Protestant Reformation responsible

for "the heartless oppression of the weak" and would have his readers believe that "liberalism begot capitalism, which in its turn is offset by socialism and communism". But the development of capitalism had begun before Rousseau, usury was as fiercely denounced by Luther as by Catholic divines, and Catholics have been as active as Protestants in helping on "big business" by lending their money whenever and wherever high rates of interest seemed compatible with safe investment.

The revisers of the late rector of Oscott's famous "Primer" tell us that the popularity of the book is the "best proof of its value"—a dangerous maxim. Nevertheless, it is a good thing to have this new and revised edition of Mgr. Parkinson's eminently useful manual. The first edition came out in 1913, and how many have been the changes and chances of economic science—as we once called political economy—in the years between! J. C.

- (i) *Report on the Visit by an All-Party Group of Members of Parliament to Spain.* (ii) *A Catholic Looks at Spain.* By José Maria de Semprún Gurrea. (Press Dept., The Spanish Embassy, London. N.p.)

THESE two pamphlets are published by the press department of the Spanish Embassy in London, and opinion concerning the Spanish war has been so inflamed by the public press that for most people the statement is sufficient to close all discussion: some will reject the booklets out of hand, others will accept them without any critical examination at all. A reviewer, however, must do his best to disentangle truth from falsehood, and, although he may find it difficult to assess correctly all the evidence adduced, it is comparatively easy to recognize propaganda and to distinguish it from a straightforward relation of facts.

The account of the visit of the M.P.s to Spain starts from a premise which is naively, not to say arrogantly, British. The group included "members of the three political parties in Parliament and was made up of three Conservatives, two Labour members and one Opposition Liberal". The notion that such a composition will automatically produce impartiality is pathetic in its assumption that the line of cleavage in European politics is the same as in the English House of Commons. Actually the report never begins to be impartial. It is a reasoned and, on the whole, a reasonable defence of the Spanish government. The members say everything that can be said for the government, and for adverse criticism they frankly admit what they cannot honestly deny. In other words the report is an advocate's plea from beginning to end. The only contact the British visitors made

with the insurgents was by telegraph with the Duke of Alba, and his reply is dismissed with the statement that "we do not accept the reasons given". It is sincerely to be hoped that the visit resulted in an amelioration of the lot of those besieged in Madrid, both the communists and their still more unfortunate prisoners. In that way it may have done good; but as a contribution towards the solution of conflicting ideas it has no value.

A Catholic Looks at Spain is in a different category. Here an attempt is made to appraise the issues from inside information. The present reviewer is not able to test the truth of the facts alleged against the insurgents, the clergy, and the aristocrats who are supporting General Franco, and there is not much to be gained by doing so; they are the kind of stories that one would expect in a fratricidal strife, and to dispute them would only lead to an atrocity-competition and a fruitless wrangle on the question: Who began it? We are far more interested in the answer to another question: How comes it that Catholic Spain, eighty per cent of whose educated men have been taught in the schools of religious orders, is in a death-struggle with irreligion, the outcome of which is still uncertain? An English priest who was in Spain on that fateful July Sunday wrote of the churches, being thronged at every Mass. On Monday they were burning. Where were the throngs? Were they among the incendiaries? Señor de Semprún Gurrea seems to think they may have been, for he says that in his experience "certain appearances of irrelegion, and even certain brutal acts against persons and things religious, are no sure evidence of a real and deep-rooted hatred of religion". That would seem to leave anti-clericalism as the only explanation. But we take to heart one piece of advice from Señor de Semprún Gurrea's book, a warning against over-simplification in judging these complicated issues. For a like reason we cannot endorse his condemnation of the insurgents because of their appeal to arms. No outsider can safely judge the point at which persecution becomes unbearable.

S. J. GOSLING.

Democracy and Revolution. By Louis Anderson Fenn. (Student Christian Movement Press. 3s. 6d. cloth; 2s. 6d. paper.)

THIS is a challenging book, less to Christians—to whom it is primarily directed—than to believers in the continuance of capitalist democracy, who are often Christians only in name. Many practising and sincere Christians, especially Catholics, will wholeheartedly agree with much of Mr. Fenn's criticism of existing democratic institutions. They will not, however, agree that the issue is quite so simple as he suggests. Because we

disapprove of Capitalism we are not therefore driven to Socialism. We look, indeed, for the economic freedom which Mr. Fenn promises us, but we look for a higher freedom beyond that, which is not necessarily secured by the establishment of a classless society. The reason, too, for our acceptance of Christianity is not, as he says, because it makes us free, but because we are convinced of its truth: personality and freedom are high in our scale of values, but they are not the highest, and it is not precisely because we care for these things that we are Christians (cf. p. 106).

The moderate tone of the book and its admirably balanced criticism will commend it to many readers who may be moved by it to set about the reform of society, though not necessarily on the lines suggested by Mr. Fenn.

EDWARD QUINN.

Peace and the Clergy. By a German Priest. Translated by Conrad C. R. Bonacina. (Sheed & Ward. 5s. net.)

THE materialistic attitude towards the problem of peace and war that has for so long had a virtual monopoly among Christians (and whose recent ebullition of pseudo-mysticism of "crusading" and death has such obvious affinities with the enthusiasm of young fascists, nazis, and communists) received its first jolt in this country from the publication of Fr. Francis Stratmann's *The Church and War* (Sheed & Ward, 1928); it might have come from Fr. Charles Plater's excellent little *Primer of Peace and War* had that not been published in the middle of a war (Catholic Social Guild, 1915). We now have a work that amplifies and improves on *The Church and War*; as its name implies, it is primarily addressed to the clergy (by one of themselves), but it is just as suitable for the consideration of lay people—and urgently demands it. It examines the religious character of the "peace movement", its relationship with Christ and with the Church, and makes perfectly clear how Catholics have failed, and continue to fail, to consult the spirit of the gospels and to follow the teaching voice of the Church in this matter of the use and abuse of war.

Impudent attempts have been made to give the impression that *Peace and the Clergy* encourages Catholics to nothing more severe than a sort of gentlemanly pietism in the face of militaristic and governmental excesses: were this the case its German author would not have found it necessary to publish it anonymously or an Englishwoman to *smuggle* his manuscript out of Germany. It is a fighting appeal for righteousness and justice, to use the so-called military virtues on behalf of peace.

D. McW.

Prophets and Princes. (5s.) *Sackcloth and Ashes.* (3s. 6d.) By Dom Hubert van Zeller, O.S.B. (Burns Oates & Washbourne.)

THESE essays are not so much studies of some Biblical characters as accounts of incidents in their lives with reflections upon them. The author does not say so, but if they are meant for boys they are admirable: there is a freshness about them, a vivid portrayal of the familiar episodes which would make them very useful in a retreat for boys. But to handle them you yourself must know your Old Testament well.

In the first of these sets of studies, Heli, Samuel, Saul, David, Roboam, Elias and Eliseus, Jehu, Josias, Achaz and Ezechias figure. Reading between the lines of the Old Testament narrative is always somewhat risky, but on the whole the author has kept his imagination under control. Now and again, however, a sentence jars: why, for instance, should Heli be described as "well cared for"? Was Saul's answer to Samuel "stinging" (p. 29)? We should rather have called it "cringing": nor does the epithet "boorish" suit Elias (p. 97). But the moral applications are excellent, e.g. pp. 11, 40, and elsewhere. The picture of Osee and his matrimonial troubles is well told, though we find it difficult to endorse the statement that he "emerges saddened and chastened and bewildered, not knowing where he stands in the sight of God and completely at sea about himself and his mission as a prophet". The second volume—in which the study of Osee is given—shows that Fr. van Zeller is no mere popularizer: he has really studied the six minor prophets of whose mission and work he here gives an account; more than that, he has learned to love them, elusive though they are and "hard of comprehension". This appears more particularly in the studies of Joel and Jonas, whom the author happily styles "the querulous", while Amos is "the poet-socialist" and Abdias "the sublime".

F. H. P.

SANDS

IRISH SAINTS IN ITALY

by

FRA ANSELMO M. TOMMASINI, O.F.M.

Introduction by FR. GREGORY CLEARY, O.F.M.

Translated with additional notes by J. F. SCANLAN

"SCHOLARLY ... RICH ... ABSORBING ..."

—A. DE BLACAM

**"MOST NOTABLE BOOK ABOUT IRELAND
OF RECENT TIMES ..."**—IRISH PRESS

"THIS GREAT BOOK ..."—TERENCE O'HANLON

"OUGHT TO BE IN EVERY LIBRARY"

—PROF. EOIN MACNEILL

DEMY 8vo.

15s. net.

532 pp.

SEND FOR SANDS BOOK LIST

15 KING ST., COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.2

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

offer a wide selection of

CHURCH FURNITURE

STATIONS

STATUES

CRUCIFIXES

finely carved by Expert Craftsmen

DEVOTIONAL ARTICLES

for private and public use

BOOKS

THEOLOGY

HISTORY

BELLES-LETTRES

ETC., ETC.

Catalogues may be obtained from

43-45 NEWGATE STREET + LONDON + E.C.1

Y

M
D

L
. .

2